

Modern Language Notes

Volume LI

JUNE, 1936

Number 6

SPENSER AND WILLIAM TURNER

The charm of the *Shepherds' Calendar* comes, at least in part, from its idiosyncratic blending of various pastoral traditions: Spenser's shepherds are poets, priests, and shepherds, alternately or simultaneously or indistinguishably. Primarily, however, they are priests, for the *Shepherds' Calendar* was written, as modern scholars¹ rightly insist,

To teach the ruder shepheard how to feede his sheepe,
And from the falsers fraud his folded flocke to keepe.

Inevitably the "falsers" in these pastorals are called wolves or foxes: the allegory is predetermined, transparent, and rich with Biblical and post-Biblical associations that need no annotation. But the proper and basic interpretation of these time-honored symbols is not the whole interpretation, for they can and do acquire local and temporal meanings that must be read in the light of particular rather than general knowledge. Everyone agrees that Spenser's wolves and foxes are false prophets, men who lead the people away from the true religion; but the commentators either neglect or try to decide too hastily exactly which false prophets Spenser had in mind. The most satisfactory method of determining Spenser's meaning is to find out the current usage in the works of his contemporaries and immediate predecessors.

The crucial passage, and potentially the most enlightening, occurs in the September eclogue, where Diggon Davie, after de-

¹The two indispensable studies are E. A. Greenlaw, "*The Shepherds Calendar*," *PMLA*, xxvi (1911), 419-451, and F. M. Padelford, "Spenser and the Puritan Propaganda," *MP*, xi (1913-1914), 85-106. J. J. Higginson, in *Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar* (New York, 1912), pp. 126-8, is more dogmatic than illuminating. His remarks on the works of William Turner cited below show acquaintance only with the titles.

scribing the sins of the shepherds, goes on to speak of the sheep; they too are in bad case, and he proceeds:

For many han into mischiefs fall,
And bene of rauenous Wolues yrent,
All for they nould be buxome and bent.

Hobbinoll.

Fye on thee Diggon, and all thy foule leasing,
Well is knowne that sith the Saxon king,
Neuer was Woolfe seene many nor some,
Nor in all Kent, nor in Christendome:
But the fewer Woolues (the soth to sayne,)
The more bene the Foxes that here remaine.

Diggon.

Yes, but they gang in more secrete wise,
And with sheepes clothing doen hem disguise,
They walke not widely as they were wont
For feare of raungers, and the great hunt:
But priuely prolling two and froe,
Enaunter they mought be inly knowe.

E. K. annotates these lines as follows:

Buxome and bent) meeke and obedient.

Saxon king) K. Edgare, that reigned here in Brytanye in the yeare of our Lorde. Which king caused all the Wolues, whereof then was store in thys countrye, by a proper policie to be destroyed. So as neuer since that time, there haue ben Wolues here founde vnlesse they were brought from other countryes. And therefore Hobbenoll rebuketh him of vntruth, for saying there be Wolues in England.

Nor in Christendome) The saying seemeth to be strange and vnreasonable: but indede it was wont to be an olde prouerbe and comen phrase. The original whereof was, for that most part of England in the reigne of king Ethelbert was christened, Kent onely except, which remayned long after in mysbeliefe and vnchristened, So that Kent was counted no part of Christendome.

Great hunt) Executing of lawes and iustice.

It needs no riddling Oedipus to determine the general purport of this passage. Professor Greenlaw explains it admirably:

Hobbinol protests that Diggon speaks too plainly. . . . He continues that Wolves have not been known in England for many years, which of course means that the Catholics have been long deprived of power, though E. K. hastens to cover the reference by one of his charmingly innocent notes

about the conditions in England as respects wild beasts. Even Hobbinal, however, recognizes that 'the fewer Woolues (the soth to sayne) The more bene the Foxes,' an idea that Diggon immediately takes up with his words about the sheep's clothing that disguises the enemies of the faith. Moreover, these enemies are not to be put to rout by the 'great Bandogs'; the needfull thing is for

'. . . heedy shepheards to discerne their face.
For all their craft is in their countenance,
They bene so graue and full of mayntenance.'

The warning is further impressed by the fable . . . the Catholics, if not watched, will yet regain control.²

This is manifestly sound, but it omits consideration of the difference between wolves and foxes. Professor Padelford suggests that Spenser "likens the Papists to wolves, and the High Church party to foxes."³ This can not be far from the truth, yet a clearer definition is desirable and possible, by the method suggested above.

Over a hundred years ago, the Rev. Henry J. Todd in his great Variorum edition of Spenser referred to a series of books that had come out shortly before Spenser's time "in which Rome is particularly called the Fox."⁴ The first book in the series, by William Turner, later Dean of Wells, is called *The hunting and finding out of the Romish fox*;⁵ published in 1543, it was a sharp condemnation of the condition of the church in England, with special reference to the activities of Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. Though the fox represents at different times the Pope, and Gardiner, and the Catholic church, and Catholic beliefs, little effective use is made of the symbolism. In a few months this was reinforced by a scurrilous blast from John Bale, *Yet a course at the Romish fox*.⁶ Then Gardiner answered Turner in a book that seems to have disappeared, whereupon Turner replied, in 1545, in the approved fashion of quotation and replication, *seriatim*. This book, called *The rescuing of the Romish fox, the second course of the hunter at the Romish fox*,⁷ has a semblance of dialogue form, for Gardiner's words are attributed to the "rescuer," Turner's to

² *Op. cit.*, p. 434.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁴ *The Works of Edmund Spenser in eight volumes*, I, 90, note on *S. C.*, May, 219; see also note on May, 309.

⁵ *S. T. C.*, 24353.

⁶ *S. T. C.*, 1309.

⁷ *S. T. C.*, 24355; note that the colophon does not read "Winchester," i. e., the place, but "have at Winchester," i. e., Stephen Gardiner.

the "hunter," but it has no true dramatic quality. All these works were printed abroad (except Gardiner's, presumably), and the first of the series was reprinted at London, probably about 1545.⁸ Then there was an intermission. The next book, also by Turner, was published in 1554 at Emden by Egidius van der Erve, who ran a press for English Protestants during Mary's reign.⁹ This work was called *The hunting of the Romish wolf*, and was reprinted during the first decade of Elizabeth's reign with a new preface and a new title: *The hunting of the fox and the wolf*.¹⁰ Here in this last book of the series Turner found his true vein. The argument follows along the same lines as in the earlier works, modified of course by the events of Mary's reign, but instead of being presented as a straightforward religious tract, it is written as a dialogue and a lively one, between a Hunter, a Foster, and a Dean: it is quite dramatic and shows a consciousness of the vitality inherent in the basic symbolism. The fine engraved plate in the first edition, still preserved in the Bodleian copy, and reproduced here, shows how the imagination of a contemporary artist was fired by Turner's 'hunting.'

Here we have grist for our mill. After some opening conversation between the Hunter and the Foster, who are both on their way to London, the Hunter says:

In euery sytting or session [of the House of Convocation] comonly there are complaintes of the multitude and ouerflowing number of shepe. But I maruel y^t ther hath ben of late yeres no cōplaint of the exceding and vnsufferable number of Wolues . . . *Foster*. . . . I do dwell in a great Forest, where as, if there were any Wolues in Englande: they shoulde be most comonly. But I neuer sawe any Wolues in my Forest, . . . nether haue I heard tel of any . . . *Hunter*. I haue sene a Wolfe within these fewe yeares in the Tower, I haue sene many in diuers Cathedrall Churches

⁸ *S. T. C.*, 24354; see also F. S. Isaac, *Printing Types*, (II), London, 1932, under *Jugge*.

⁹ *S. T. C.*, 24356; see Frank Isaac, "Egidius van der Erve and his Protestant books," *Library*, IV, xii (1932-33), 336-52. The Bodleian copy contains a fine engraved plate reproduced herein.

¹⁰ *S. T. C.*, 24357; William Herbert in his edition of Joseph Ames's *Typographical Antiquities*, III, 1576, suggests 1561 as the date of publication and John Knox (very tentatively) as the author of the new preface. The place of publication remains uncertain; the cut on the last page is in the manner of Holbein, the cut on the title-page—inspired by the engraved plate in the earlier edition—also seems foreign.

of Englande. But there are no where mo thē are in the Cōuocation house, in the parliament tyme.¹¹

After further discussion the Foster finally catches on to the Hunter's meaning and acknowledges the truth of the description. In complete accord on religion, they proceed on their way until they overtake a Dean, whom they decide to "hunt." They ask him about wolves and he replies:

In my daies I haue sene no Wolfe in Englande, that I wote of, nether haue I heard of any man yt hath sene any. Wherefore I beleue that there is none in Englande, at the least in yt parte of Englande that I dwell in. *Hunter*. Sir I haue heard tell of more murder of shepe of late, then euer I heard of, in my daies before, wherefore whē as we haue no mo foxes then we had wont to haue, and haue mo hunters of the Fox thē euer we had before, I can not thinke but that we haue some wolues in the lande, which kil the shepe. *Dean*. How should we haue wolues in this lande when they nether brede here, nether are brought into the lande.¹²

Then follows an extraordinary discussion of spontaneous generation; finally the Hunter says:

A Foxe and a Wolfe, are very like in diuers thinges, thinke ye it not possible, but yt an olde Foxe mai go forth of kinde, into a Wolfe?¹³

This possibility is also discussed at some length, and the Hunter at last brings in evidence:

The moste parte of all the honest men that are in England, will beare witnes, that about .v. yeares ago, there was an olde foxe caried into the Tower of London, where as, he hath continued vntill these fewe monethes, and that the same is a very right Wolfe, nowe, and goeth abrode and is sene of all men, and if that ye go to London I am sure that ye shall se him. *Dean*. Perchaunce ye meane of my lorde of Winchester, whom certaine railers haue called a Romishe foxe.¹⁴

It is unnecessary to quote further to illustrate Turner's usage of 'fox' and 'wolf.' The particular wolf who is hunted in this tract is the Bishop of Winchester, the very man who had previously been attacked as the fox. But as Gardiner is the principal wolf, so the distinction between all wolves and all foxes is defined by the application of the terms to him. Thus to Turner a fox is a person who seems to be or pretends to be a member of the Church of

¹¹ A4^v-A5^v; this and subsequent quotations are taken from the Emden edition.

¹² A6-A6^v.

¹³ B1.

¹⁴ B1^v.

England, though at heart he has Romish beliefs, while a wolf is a Romanist in both belief and outward profession. Edwardian foxes become Marian wolves, and, as we now know, Marian wolves similarly become Elizabethan foxes.¹⁵

It seems certain to me that Turner's use of "fox" and "wolf" is unimpeachable as a criterion for interpreting Spenser (and E. K.). Both men belong to the same tradition, though Spenser even in his radical youth was never as thorough-going in his reforming zeal as Turner. Both were Pembroke men, and in fact Turner was an influential member of the earlier group that gave Pembroke the strongly Protestant cast it retained for so long. It is thus thoroughly reasonable to use Turner's dialogue to interpret Spenser's September eclogue. Similarly E. K.'s excursion into natural history has the same function as Turner's: its very irrelevance helps to emphasize the religious attitudes it pretends to conceal. And the discussion of the ease of the fox-wolf transformation is particularly useful in introducing the tale of Roffy and Lowder that follows immediately afterwards.

The resemblance is so startling that it is at least highly probable

¹⁵ Equating foxes with High Church Anglicans and wolves with Roman Catholics is not quite the same as this distinction, and it easily becomes misleading because Protestants varied greatly in their definitions of essentially Protestant and Romanist practice. Turner's summary shows how thoroughgoing a reformer he was:

"... al they that in their preachinges saye that it is vnlawful for bisshopes or prestes to haue wiues, that it is not lawfull to eate fleshe in Lent by the lawe of God, that a prest ought to haue a shauen crowne, a syde gowne, an Albe and vestiment vpon him when he ministreth the Lordes Supper, that a bishop is higher then a preste or elder by ye lawe of God, that there ought to be Images, Aulters, Crosses, Candels, Censures, Holye water, Holy breade, Palmes singinge of Latine in the Church, where the people vnderstandeth no Latine, that Saintes ought to be called vpō, that we can help the dead with our praiers, yt there is no bread and wine in the supper, after the prest haue said these .v. wordes, *Hoc est corpus meum*, that no man ought to be a minister, except he be subdeacon, and deacon before, and therewith haue receiued benet and collet, and that no man ought to be admitted vnto the order of a subdeacon, deacon, or els an elder or preste, except he vowe chastite before: preache and say those thinges, which God neuer comaunded them to say" (C8-C8r). Again: "to set vp candels, to lift vp their handes to bread and wine, to pray to saintes, to pray for the dead to heare the piping of the organes, & preche not the word of God, nether exhorte ye people to worship God in spirite and truthe..." (D4). Spenser certainly never went as far as this.

that E. K. had Turner's passage clearly in mind when he was writing; but to describe it also as a source of Spenser's lines is doubtful, in any very exact sense. There is a good deal in Turner's works that can be paralleled in the *Shepherds' Calendar* and in the ecclesiastical satire of *Mother Hubbard's Tale*, and I think that Spenser had read Turner and that the apparent reminiscences are actual reminiscences; but that is a small matter. What is important is that Spenser found here and in other Reformers of the transition period a way of thinking, a way of using symbols that was congenial to him and of vital significance in his work. Turner began with the Biblical identification of wolves and foxes with false prophets; this led him into the field of his major preoccupation—preaching. Wolves and foxes are those who preach false doctrine or do not preach at all or inhibit others from preaching. And from this it is but a short step to identify the animals with particular sects and particular people. But one identification does not cancel the other. Therefore the reader who tries to limit the fox to the Pope or to the Bishop of Winchester or to the High Church party fails to do justice to the author, who found no difficulty in shifting from one to the other or having several in mind simultaneously. As with Turner, so with Spenser. The reader of Spenser must be as supple in following as the author is in leading—ready to spot a personal attack and equally ready to swim in an undefined medium that connotes only a general attitude of mind.¹⁰

HAROLD STEIN

Washington, D. C.

HERDER'S RUSSIAN UTOPIA

On his first visit to Riga in 1769 Johann Gottfried Herder, philosopher, historian, poet, aesthete, critic, and educator, was yet stirred with an aspiration to become the ruler of Livonia. Disillusioned at his own country and century, allegedly of hirelings and copyists,¹ Herder, forever longing and projecting,² decided to

¹⁰ My opportunity for making this study came through my tenure of a Sterling Fellowship.

¹ Herder, *Suphan* xxiv, 11. Berlin, 1877.

² Kühnemann, Eugen, *Herders Leben*. München, 1895.

summon all his forces of body and spirit toward the fruition of a free and prosperous Russia.

The dream of a Slavonic Renaissance was in the air. Pre-eminently German, the movement was inaugurated by Professor Ludwig von Schlüger, who during his stay at the court of the great Catherine was first to foresee and announce in historical and philological writing the unlimited resources of the country and its inhabitants.³ In his enthusiastic footsteps followed at once others: Gebhardt, Engel, Adelung.⁴

The pervading principle, that the reform of the Slavs, imperative, radical and all-embracing, should come from without, is accepted by Herder as his own thesis in the *Journal meiner Reise im Jahr 1769*.⁵ An alien, he has been selected by Providence itself to lead Livonia, this most foreign of Russia's possessions, out of chaos into light and glory.

What avenue of fulfillment! Now the cradle of license, poverty, and crime, a literary and moral desert, Livonia will rise, a thrice glorious Greece, to productivity, honor, freedom, unlimited intellectual grasp. What an opportunity for the giant country, sleeping as yet a dream of music! What an undertaking for a man "of intellect and imagination, heart and sensibility"⁶—Herder! Can he still waver? Still postpone the duty which history, science, heredity make compulsive?

The need presses. The Russians, generous, hospitable and peaceful, are withal lazy, imitative, pleasure-seeking, superficial,⁷ and, worse still, slaves to tradition, to upbringing, to one another, and to themselves. Immediately these abuses should be eradicated. From local and purely social reform⁸ the battle-cry of freedom will spread to nations, continents . . . it will consume humanity. A new race is in the coming . . . Prometheus is rustling his eager wings. . . .

But alas, another of Herder's grandiose schemes was doomed at its very inception. Blessed with all the riches of soil and intellect, the Russian paradise is to remain a chimera, its freedom an Utopia. It will continue its existence of chained arrogant tyrants

³ Schierenberg, Rolf, *Der politische Herder*, 64, 65. Graz, 1932.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Herder, iv, 345-461, 363, 365, xiv, 277.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

and tyrannical cowards. The lack,—an essentially organic one with Herder, to whom language and character are forever one,⁹ is at once factual and philological: the non-existence in Russian speech and thought of a term for *citizen*. “Die Ehre will, dass man sich von Mitbürgern unterscheide, schöne, grosse, ausserordentliche Handlungen thue: ein Russe kann nicht diese Triebfeder haben, denn er hat keine Mitbürger: er hat für Bürger kein Wort in seiner Sprache.”¹⁰

From both the idiomatic and the ideographical viewpoint Herder's assertion is most vulnerable. It is true that any precise postulation of the date at which the Russian for *citizen*—*grazhdanin* first appears in literary texts and is adopted in common usage is made hazardous by the fact that from the outset the term is made to cover two more or less divergent conceptions: city-dweller and freeman. However, a process of crystallization in which the term *grazhdanin* begins to denote city-inhabitant, that of *grazhdanin*—a responsible member of the community, adumbrates the activity of Herder by at least a half-millennium. As attested by Professor I. I. Sresnevsky in his voluminous *Materialy dlia slovaria drevne-russkago iazyka po pis mennym pamiatnikam* (*Materials for a Dictionary of the Ancient Russian Language, according to Written Monuments*), published by the Imperial Academy of Sciences 1890-1912, the following data have been collected on this word (1, 577):

1. “Grazhanin,” meaning the resident of a city, has been found in *Zhitie Alekseia, chelovieka Bozhiia* (*The Life of Aleksei, the God's Man*), contained in the *Zlatosotroi*, a MS of the twelfth century.

2. “Grazhdanin,” meaning a citizen, was used in *Kniga Pro-roka Jeremia* (*The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*), copied in the fifteenth century from the *Upr's Likhoi*, dated 1047.

Whatever the subsequent mutation in meaning of the two names, it is exactly during the days that Herder's Russian Utopia struck the bulwark of idiomatic shortage that the country's literary and political life became markedly citizen-conscious. The great Peter

⁹ Ergang, Robert, *Herder and the foundations of German Nationalism*, 146-149. New York, 1931.

¹⁰ Herder, iv, 419.

had led the way. The outworn and cumbersome ecclesiastic alphabet of boyar days yields under his ukase to a civic speller, a civic accounting system, and a civic printing press. The policy gains in articulation and consciousness under Catherine: the reprint of the *Grazhdanka* has for its professed purpose the education of the Russian citizen. This, as visualized by Diderot and wholeheartedly endorsed by the Empress, is an aim lofty enough to justify all means of attainment, the sole guarantee of inner and outer security.

So inherently ingrown in the schemes of Catherine became the ideal of a blessedly enlightened freeman, that the painter Levitzki, undoubtedly the most talented and farsighted portraitist of his day,¹² depicts the Czarina burning the symbolic poppy of her own rest before the altar of the communal welfare, and wearing in recognition thereof not a monarch's, but a citizen's crown.

Parallel in direction, if diversified in accent and emphasis, is the tone of the Pleiade of court poets and dramatists surrounding the throne: Lomonosov, Tretiakowsky, Sumarokov, Cheraskov, Nikolev, Chvostov, and Derzhavin.

If Lomonosov (1711-1785) the self-appointed and thriving¹³ singer of courtly odes, welcoming with equal vehemence the ascension, succession, and demise of sovereigns, replaces frequently the term *Grazhdane* in his essentially archaic diction by the mythological *Rossy*, *Syny Rossiiskie*, and *Rossiane*,¹⁴ the absolutistic *Poddannye*,¹⁵ and the perhaps most current *Zhiteli* and *Obyvateli*,¹⁶ if the poet is infinitely more concerned with Russia's frontiers than with its spirit, he bows nevertheless before the city as a luminous symbol of everlasting wisdom and progress, an eternal triumph of man over nature's chaos. The epithets: necessary, peaceful, joyous, great, holy, blessed, heavenly, godly, splendid, brilliant, are only a few of the galaxy, with which Lomonosov invariably lauds the achievement of Peter in imparting to the Russians the glories of denizenry.¹⁷

¹² Diagilev, C. P., *Russkaia Zhivopis v XVIII veke*. I, 30.

¹³ I, 47; 87; 103; 106; 121; 123; 142, 144, 146. St. Petersburg, 1794.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 55, 225, 229, 213, 258, 260, 234, 249, 250.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 249, 250, 69, 170, 171, 205; I, 142, 144, 133, 146, 150-59, 160-190, 197, 207, 270-274.

This czar treasured in an equal measure the bodily and the spiritual wellbeing of the citizen entrusted to his charge, and his very name spells to Lomonosov gratitude and blessedness.

"Tam . . . gradonachalniki i grazhdane vspominaiut trudy Petrovy,"¹⁸ or "Drugie prolivali krov svoich grazhdan; Pietri-nikogda."¹⁹ Only once a similarly far-reaching accomplishment is credited to the first of the Romanoffs, Michael: "on sobiralet rastochennykh grazhdan."²⁰

Not so much the privileges as the duties of the Russians, particularly in regard to family and state, are laid down in the tragedies of Lomonosov's contemporary, Michael Cherkasov. These obligations are conceived as immutable superior laws. "Oh, put grazhdan nebesnykh" (Oh, the heavenly road of citizens), reads the opening line of the "Venezianskaia Monachinia" (The Sister of Venice), and an analogous sentiment is clothed in a nearly similar wording in the same author's "Martenia and Thalestra."²²

An unflinching regard for peace, justice, and tolerance, is, according to Sumarokov, the distinguishing characteristic of an educated son of his country. No concern is more paramount than familiarity with and respect for the law; no statute more to be revered than the civic code. The dramatist coins a new word: *grazhdanstvo*—the citizenry. "Narusha pravy vse zakonov i grazhdanstva" (Having trespassed the laws of citizenry),²³ and insists over and over again: "Neschastliv tot cheloviek, kto grazhdanskikh prav ne znaet" (Unhappy is the man, who is unfamiliar with the civil code).²⁴ Again: "Voiennye ludi govoriat o voine, grazhdanskii o zakonakh" (Just as the warrior speaks of war, so the citizen discusses the law).²⁵

Such an idyll of sincere brotherly love, the reward of emancipation in matters of self-government, is painted with glowing sympathy in the dramas of the period. Pavel Potemkin opens his "Torzhestvo družby" (The triumph of friendship) with a scene of a *dolce far niente* in some blessed state: "Grazhdanie mirnye priatnost sna vkushaiut" (The peaceful citizens enjoy the delights of dreams)²⁶ and Piotr Plavilshchikov lauds in his tragedy "Druz-

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 204, 260, 208.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ 3; 107; Derzhavin, 149.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ 52 (1757); 10 (1750); 129.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ 3 (1773); 107 (1750); 52.

hestvo" (Friendship) the mutual esteem of one's rights as man's highest good.²⁷

Even a note of irony makes its appearance, when with Sumarokov the civic law is made to distinguish a box on the ear from a slap in the face.²⁸

The purely national model of a freeman, in contrast to the civic and judiciary, is presented by Nikolev, Chvostov, and partly Plavilshchikov. If the bonds of the ruler and his subjects are indissoluble in times of peace, they grow still more holy in war. "Spieshi, gosudar, na pomosch grazhdan svoich!"²⁹ Scenes of devastation and annihilation bring into bolder relief the oneness of monarch and subjects.³⁰

No less general, if curiously paradoxical, is the eminently Western motive of complaint against this very foreign importation of clothes, manners, speech, and, again typically for the period, prosody. Already Lomonosov had defended the idiom of Russian citizens against foreign invasion.³¹ The poet finds it by far superior to the German dialects and praises its uniformity and its wide appeal. Both Nikolai Nikolev and Dmitriy Chvostov, the first with his comedy "Samolubivyi Stichotvorietz,"³² the second with "Russkyi Parizhanietz,"³³ point to the danger of imitation grafted on ignorance of native tendencies. To this condemnation of Russian idolatry of imported idioms Sumarokov adds his voice,³⁴ and defends in his letters to Shuvalov his autonomy of Russian freeman and poet.³⁵

Perhaps the largest single contribution to the growth of the conception of citizenry in Russia is that of Krylov (1768-1844), whose fables form a "fountain of sparkling, splashing, drowning criticism"³⁶ of Slavic life at large, and its apathy and passiveness

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Plavilshchikov, *Druzhba*, 107; Cheraskov, *Plamena*, 12; Sumarokov, *Dimitriy Samozvanyet*, 54 (1771); Tretiakovsky, *Deidamia* (1750).

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Lomonosov, I, 7, 139, 153, 52. *Pisma Lomonosova i Sumarokova k I. I. Shuvalovu*, St. Petersburg, 1862.

³² *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Jarintzov, N., *Russian Poets and Poems*, 7. New York, 1917, Krylov, I, 13, 15, 16, 19; II, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16, 19; III, i, 7, 9, 12. St. Petersburg, 1895.

in internal policies in particular.³⁷ The ills of class prejudice, ignorance, venality, avarice, selfishness, pretense, and false friendship are exposed in an endless variety of settings, while in more than one instance the tragic denouement is brought about by the ills of foreign polish coupled with indifference to one's own law. "Grazhdanskich prav bars ne ponimaet." . . .³⁸

With the important history of Karamsin the stress is transferred once more to the legislative aspects of *denizenry*. Incidentally, the author of the voluminous "*Istoria Gosudarstva Rossiyskavo*" considers the word *grazhdanin* sufficiently inherent in the Russian tongue to illustrate with it the scenes of the country's earliest history,³⁹ while in the numerous notes drawn from the *Lietopisi*, the word *Grazhane* or *Gorozhane* is more frequently found.⁴⁰ As paramount themes stand out: the *grazhdankyi ustav*,⁴¹ *grazhdanskoie obschestvo*,⁴² *grazhdanskaia istoria*,⁴³ and, still more importantly, the new *Grazhdanstvennost*, the quality of being a citizen:⁴⁴ "Novgorod nasadil nam pervyia semena grazhdanstvennosti" (Novgorod imparted to us the first seeds of citizenry).

Still other discoveries attest the comparatively wide circulation of the term *citizen* prior to and at the time of Herder's activity. A title of a work by Samuel Pufendorf, translated into Russian and published in St. Petersburg in 1726, reads: *O dolzhnosti chelovieka i grazhdanina*. (Concerning the duty of Man and Citizen.) Moreover, the term *Grazhdanin* is included in a dictionary published in Moscow as early as 1771, only four years after the voicing of Herder's first complaint. Its common use before that date could be inferred from the fact that the rank of *pochetnyi grazhdanin* (honorary citizen) was introduced in Moscow in 1785.⁴⁵ The year 1783 saw a reprint of the Pufendorf work, and a recommendation for its use in the school curriculum.⁴⁶

It may be noticed in this connection that in the reactionary reign of Paul I, with Herder at work on his *Kalligone*, a censorship regulation issued in 1797 proscribed the use of the word

³⁷ *Ibid.*³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ Karamsin, VI, 6, 7, 13; XIII, 385-392; I, 315, 452, 463, 484, 238; X, 4, 15, 39, 48, 82, 119, 127; VI, 286, 324, 342-350; I, 411, 443, 484; VII, 359, 361; II, 303, 345, 348, 368; IV, 364, 371, 372; VI, 44.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*⁴¹ *Ibid.*⁴² *Ibid.*⁴³ *Ibid.*⁴⁴ *Ibid.*⁴⁵ Diagilev, I, 30; Lecitzki*, *Sobesednik*, VI, 18.⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

grazhdane (plural of *grazhdanin*), recommending the safer substitution of *zhiteli* and *obyvateli*, city residents.

As to the concept of freeman, it is incarnate from the very first in the principles of the Russian Commonwealth.⁴⁷ The citizens formed the nucleus of the great Novgorod Republic, the first self-governing body of modern Europe. "Schon sehr früh wird Gross-Novgorod der Mittelpunkt historischen Lebens im nördlichen Russland: nach der bekannten Erzählung der *Jahrbilder* stand Novgorod an der Spitze des Bündnisses der Stämme, welche die Waräger herbeiriefen: neuere Forscher führen nicht selten die Anfänge Novgorods in frühere Perioden hinab."⁴⁸

Helped and shielded by geographical inaccessibility, fostered by unceasing and violent internal feuds, the "free city" of Novgorod, followed later by that of Pskov,⁴⁹ presents a highly organized and complex unit of self-administration.⁵⁰ The center of authority is vested in the *Vietche*, the prototype of the modern *Duma*, a regime more absolute than that of the prince.⁵¹ It controls all matters of magnitude: elects the heads of local government, makes and dissolves treaties,⁵² finally, it has charge of all criminal jurisdiction.⁵³ Little by little this democratic type of government absorbs the autonomy of the monarch, "in spite of the fact that it possessed a prince."⁵⁴ If anything, the political and individual rights of the free citizen were upheld still more sacredly in Pskov.⁵⁵ Suffice it but to call to mind the great heroes of Russian legend—not princes, nor even warriors, but "free citizens": Sadko and Buslaiev!⁵⁶

Undoubtedly, Herder's misapprehensions may be led directly back to his "Sturm and Drang" with its surplus of enthusiasm and lack of reasoning. At least in part they result from the obvious unfamiliarity with the speech and the thought of the country which he dreams to reform. From Herder's own stand-

⁴⁷ Alexinsky, Gregor, *Modern Russia*, 197. London.

⁴⁸ Bestujew-Rjumin, *Geschichte Russlands*, 230. Mitau, 1874.

⁴⁹ Kluchevsky, V. O., *A History of Russia*, I, 325-327. London, 1911.

⁵⁰ Platonov, S., *Histoire de la Russie. Des origines à 1918*, 26, 78, 81. Paris, 1929.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Bestujew-Rjumin, 274-287.

⁵³ Kluchevsky, 325, 327, 355.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

point, as expounded in the *Journal*,⁵⁷ an offense of the most weighty, to us perhaps a blessing in disguise!⁵⁸

LUBOV KEEFER

The Johns Hopkins University

GRILLPARZER'S RELATION TO CLASSICAL IDEALISM

Literary Criticism rather early recognized the fact that Grillparzer followed Schiller's model in his earliest dramatic attempts and plans, as in *Lucretia Creinwell*, *Seelengrösze*, *Robert von der Normandie*, and that from about 1809 on, besides that of Shakespeare and the Romanticists, he yielded more to the influence of Goethe, as e. g., in his *Faustplan*, *Irenens Wiederkehr* and the dramatic sketch *Spartakus*. As to Grillparzer's mature works, Goethe's influence is especially seen in the characters of Sappho and Hero and in the Greek setting of *Sappho*, *Das goldene Vlies*, and *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*; a Goethean desire for classical simplicity and harmony is attributed to the recurring inspiration from *Iphigenie*.

This more or less exterior influence, however, is not the subject at hand. Our question is rather: what was Grillparzer's inner response to classical idealism, and what influence had this response as such on the composition of his dramas?

Blanka von Kastilien most closely follows the example of Schiller's *Don Karlos*. The classic-idealistic antithesis of despotism and political freedom, of moral heteronomy and autonomy is still noticeable in the theme of Grillparzer's drama. Especially the impudent passion of Maria de Padilla, the cold rationalism of Rodrigo de Padilla's intrigue and the brutality of King Pedro reflect the dependence on the classical model. The antipole, however, is no longer moral antonomy in the classic-idealistic meaning of the word. Fedriko's conception of duty toward the king is not based on an insight into the moral value of allegiance, but on

⁵⁷ Hapgood, I. F., *The Epic Songs of Russia*, 357, 39, 201. New York, 1886.

⁵⁸ Herder, iv, 422-430; Andress, J., *Johann Gottfried Herder as an Educator*, 188-189. New York, 1916. Haym, R., *Herder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken*, I, 53. Kühnemann, 10.

tradition; it is heteronomous and amoral, if not immoral, according to classical standards; and his relation to Blanka is, in spite of all Schillerean influence, just as much determined by a conventional respect for the empty form of a marriage which hardly ever existed in fact. The logic of this situation requires a non-Schillerean solution; but only death is allowed to join those who naturally belong together. This uncertainty with respect to moral decisions, proves that Grillparzer tries to break away from classical idealism, that he begins to doubt absolute moral postulates and their realization; that, on the other hand, he is still dependent on those postulates, that he does not dare yet to substitute for them a solution which would do better justice to the life situation of his drama.

This doubt grows to skepticism in Grillparzer's *Die Ahnfrau*, a play which suggests not only the often made comparison with Schiller's *Braut von Messina*, but also with Goethe's *Iphigenie*. Schiller submits his characters to fate, in order to show how the moral freedom of man is able to maintain itself against the strongest pressure of necessity; and Goethe's Orestes is lifted through the sisterly love of Iphigenie to the idealism of humanity. The difference in Grillparzer's treatment is not sufficiently explained by a reference to the fate-dramas of the late Romantics. It is at least as important to state that the idealistic moral postulate manifests itself in his drama. The Ahnfrau herself impersonates the conflict between idealistic and vitalistic will, a conflict which is clearly expressed in Günther's words:

Haszt sie die vergangne Sünde,
Liebt sie die vergangne Glut.

It is significant for Grillparzer's own dilemma that Jaromir is longing for a life of innocence and goodness and that he hopes to find the realization of this ideal through his love for Berta. This ideal intention, however, has, contrary to all idealistic belief in a moral world order, a depraving effect; it is responsible for Jaromir's fatal love for his sister. He is completely blinded by his passion after he has discovered that Berta is his sister, and thus the irresistibility of his desire is an extreme expression of Grillparzer's doubt in the possibility of idealistic conduct; it reveals the sensualistic basis of idealistic striving; it evidences a disillusion comparable only to that expressed in Grabbe's *Herzog Theodor von Gothland* or in Büchner's *Danton's Tod*. Besides that, Grillparzer develops—

again in clear, although hardly conscious contrast with Goethe's *Iphigenie*—the idea of rootedness in an organic environment and its opposite, eradication. This existential rootedness has an almost deterministic effect on moral conduct. Goethe's *Iphigenie*, too, suffers from the separation from her native land, but this suffering develops her character to greater purity and constancy. Grillparzer's Jaromir, however, becomes a robber in the separation from his home-environment. The fact that Jaromir was robbed as a child does not detract from the validity of this interpretation, since the idea of existential rootedness is applied in subsequent dramas in more and more conscious reaction against classical idealism in the characterization of Medea, Jason, Kunigunde (in *König Ottokars Glück und Ende*) and of Otto von Meran (in *Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn*).

The idealistic starting point is also apparent in *Sappho*. Grillparzer's ideas, to be sure, do not differ quite as radically from Goethe's as from Schiller's ideas, because Goethe and Grillparzer represent a more organic conception of life than Schiller. Thus, Goethe's Torquato Tasso doubts, like Sappho, the value of art in comparison to that of life; but Tasso's antipode, the statesman Antonio, in turn envies the poet, and the result is but a tragic resignation to the inescapable one-sidedness of every great talent. Sappho's fate, however, cannot be interpreted as a tragic and heroic resignation to her ideal calling, but only as a disillusioned estrangement from idealism. Sappho is disappointed in life, because she realizes the isolation from concrete existence imposed on her by ideal pursuits. In the last analysis, her tragedy can only be understood as an expression of Grillparzer's development away from idealism, as reluctant yielding to his growing conviction that man cannot rise from his concrete existential basis into a free, independent realm of ideality. It is the tragedy of the idealist who believes that he is able to free himself from the elementary basis of his existence and who finds it impossible to readjust himself to the demands of reality.

At this point the most essential axioms of classical idealism are abandoned. In *Das goldene Vlies* moral freedom becomes almost illusive, if one interprets freedom in the classical sense as freedom to choose moral goods and freedom to restrict one's will by the recognition of moral principles. Medea and Jason are doomed to moral decline by the fact that they leave the sphere allotted to

them by birth and symbiosis, and that is also the tragic fate of Kunigunde in *König Ottokars Glück und Ende* and of Otto von Meran in *Ein treuer Diener seines Herrn*.

Whereas in his first dramas Grillparzer struggles with idealistic beliefs and although they are defeated, assigns them a prominent active part in the motivation of the play, in his later dramas, especially from *Das goldene Vlies* on, the positive moral will is almost completely reduced to the self-limitation in an appropriate environment and to a definite stage in life, and the negative side is represented by the transgression or absence of these limitations. Classical idealism conceived moral goodness as an active decision and badness as a passive yielding to heteronomous influences. Grillparzer arrives at the opposite view that moral goodness is mainly inactive rootedness in an environment, and that evil arises from the transgression of limitations in the concrete existential situation of man. Accordingly, reason gradually loses its highest dignity as supreme judge on moral issues; it becomes mainly an instrument of the will to live, and as such it exerts the dubious function of enabling man to transcend his organic sphere of existence and to strive for aims regardless of existential limitations, thereby menacing the originally organic structure of his environment and preparing ruin for himself and for the environment.

The transition from classical idealism to Grillparzer is a transition from an individualistic conception of man to an existential conception, *i. e.*, man's existence is conceived as essentially symbiotic, as being together with others, as being in active and reactive communication with others. The implications of this change and their influence on the problematic structure of Grillparzer's later dramas transcend the scope of this paper which is only concerned with Grillparzer's breaking away from the classical inheritance.

This development is similar to that of Schopenhauer who inverted the classical relation of idea and will in favor of the unreflected, instinctive rootedness of man in his existential environment. Like Schopenhauer, Grillparzer arrives in and through his work at the tragic conclusion that reason severs man from his existential basis and drives him into an isolation in which he faces physical and moral catastrophe.

The relation to classical idealism as outlined in this paper should eliminate all doubt about Grillparzer's place in the literary history of the nineteenth century. Like Grabbe, he inherited the classical

belief in the existence of an ideal order and developed through a stage of disillusion to a more realistic conception of the world; but, belonging to an older generation than Grabbe, he was more imbued with idealistic views and as an Austrian more deeply rooted in an organic environment, so that his adjustment to the realistic trend of the nineteenth century was never as complete as Grabbe's. In the development of the nineteenth century he always regretted the progress of disintegration of an organic structure.—In this respect for the organic structure of life Grillparzer remained in spiritual affinity with Goethe.

F. W. KAUFMANN

Oberlin College

THE POPULAR RIÑA IN LOPE DE RUEDA

Among the factors that enabled Lope de Rueda to strike the "popular vein" successfully, none proved more effective than his knack at reproducing the popular *riña*, *pendencia*, *reyerta*, or *pelea*. In one form or another, the *riña* is prominent in almost all his plays, *comedias* as well as *pasos*, and in *El rufián cobarde* it constitutes the sole theme of the action.

Compared with the *riñas* of his predecessors, Rueda's are found to be much more varied in character and length and much more dramatic in structure and language. In some cases, as in *El rufián cobarde* and the Vallejo-Grimaldo incident in the *Eufemia*, they settle a score, have a beginning, a middle, and an end, and are finished little plays in themselves regardless of whether they appear as *pasos* or as parts of *comedias*. In other cases—for example, the Guadalupe-Mencieta, the Melchior-Ximena, and the Guiomar-Julieta wrangles in the *Armelinea*, the *Eufemia*, and *Los engaños*, respectively—they are repeated outbursts of ill feeling due to no particular provocation and are engaged in as a matter of course whenever the two servants meet. There are also incipient *riñas*, generally of a bantering or teasing character, whose principal dramatic purpose, like that of the *lances* in the plays of the Siglo de Oro, seems to be to start things off with rapid dialogue and action, *riñas* in monologue, like that of Ortega in the second *escena* of the *Medora*, early morning squabbles, when "todos duermen en Camora," between husband and wife in the *Armelinea*

and *Las aceitunas*, and quarrels between persons of social standing, as in the eighth *escena* of *Los engaños*.

That Lope de Rueda was not the first writer to take advantage of the dramatic possibilities of the *riña*—nor, it should be added, the last—is sufficiently well known. Enough antecedent *riña* literature exists to warrant the belief that scenes exhibiting popular altercations had become by Rueda's time a kind of "set piece" and that something like an art of the *riña*, similar to the *arte de reñir* in real life described by Valdés,¹ was in the process of development. The vast superiority of Rueda's *riñas* to those of his predecessors, however, is so marked and has been so little commented upon that it deserves attention if only for purposes of comparative evaluation. Incidentally, it explains in great measure how, in spite of his deep indebtedness to the Italians for the subject-matter of his regular plays, he managed to imbue them with a genuinely national Spanish spirit.

On the purely theatrical side, it might appear that Rueda could introduce nothing new into the presentation of *riñas*. His predecessors understood the value of wordy brawls as a matter of stage "business" and Torres Naharro, for one, put the *riña* to systematic use, alternating it fairly regularly with the more serious action in much the same way that the playwrights of the Siglo de Oro utilized the *gracioso* scenes. However, the variety of individuals, moods, actions, gestures, manners of speech, and kinds of horse-play in Rueda is such that the *riñas* of Torres Naharro's *rústicos* and *hortelanos* strike one today as flat, monotonous, and antiquated—quite the reverse of Rueda's, which at this late date retain almost intact their original vitality. Evidently Rueda's dramatic skill in the construction of *riñas* was a capital factor in the public favor accorded his theatrical performances and it is significant that Cervantes praises him especially for his acting in the rôles of *bobo*, *vizcaino*, *negra*, and *rufián*, whose *riñas* are often the only justification for their appearance in the plays.

On the verbal or linguistic side, Rueda's *riñas* mark a notable advance in realistic truth of expression and artistic selection of detail. At one stroke, the language of the *riña* is raised by him from humdrum boorishness, coarse vituperation, and stilted exag-

¹ In *José (Obras completas, VIII, Madrid, 1902)*, pp. 123-4.

geration,² which are immediately recognized as factitious and unnatural, to an almost perfect illusion of reality. Whether the result of gifted improvisation or exceedingly clever artifice, his *riñas* ring true. They could have happened on any street or in any house.

An analysis of the language of Rueda's *riñas*—which, as is to be expected, is in the main of billingsgate caliber—demonstrates that, while he took over the conventionalized elements of the *riña* employed by his predecessors, he usually improved upon them in the direction of characterization, popular tone, and distinctiveness. Such commonplaces as strong epithets, maledictions, recrimination, and *refranes*, which are the sum and substance of preceding *riñas*, become vivid and genial under his touch and are as a rule invested with individuality or personality. The proverbial expressions, for instance, which are heaped up pell-mell in the Arcipreste de Talavera and Fernando de Rojas and could be used interchangeably by any of the characters, are assigned by Rueda with discriminating choice. They have frequently the improvised imagery appropriate to the particular person, the peculiarities of pronunciation, and the indefiniteness of reference which are observable in any popular brawl³ and avoid completely the appearance of having been drawn from a *refranero*—the latter fault being only too perceptible in the *Celestina*. Many of them are so thoroughly Spanish and local in sentiment and expression that they have a meaning for Spaniards

² It is a curious fact that Torres Naharro, who, according to Juan de Valdés, "wrote best on low and plebeian subjects," is uninspired in his popular *riñas* and that Fernando de Rojas, who painted low life with stark realism, becomes artificial, rhetorical, and bookish in most of his billingsgate.

³ E. g., *Lope de Rueda, Teatro*, "Clásicos castellanos," Madrid, 1924: p. 38, "podían fiar della oro sin cuento, como á una gata parida una vara de longaniza"; p. 73, "yo los embiaré antes que amanezca á caçar gaviluchos á los robles de Mechualón"; p. 104, "ó na forza ne va, nerrechos se pierde; honra y barbechos no caben la sacos"; p. 116, "¡Afuera hay cantos, moxeca de Arjona!"; p. 121, "Tal te quiero, Crespa: y ella era tiñosa"; pp. 122-3, "Ya, ya; maten aquel gaçapo; ¿para qué es nada desso, la de Alonso?"; p. 166, "¿no alcanzavas con la mano un prato del vasar y querías ya tener breço en casa?" Böhl von Faber, *Teatro español anterior a Lope de Vega*, Hamburg, 1832: p. 371, "Espérole el reloj de Guadalupe!"; p. 410, "allá se lo haya Marta con sus pollos, que yo mas querria buena olla que mal testimonio."

alone—and often only for Spaniards of Rueda's own day—and remain singularly free from any effort at securing the universality of application that distinguishes the *refranes* of Rueda's forerunners and contemporaries.

The innovations introduced into *riña* scenes by Rueda are numerous. Most of them found their way into the *riñas* of later writers and more particularly into Cervantes' *entremeses*, one of which, *El juez de los divorcios*, is an admirable specimen of sustained billingsgate on the Rueda order. Whether these innovations were premeditated or not or whether or not Rueda, who had the instinct of the artist, realized that little advantage was being taken in his day of the dramatic and artistic possibilities of the *riña*, the fact remains that he specialized in *riñas* both as a writer and as an actor and radically modified the form in which they were presented.

Several of his practices, though seemingly unimportant, make all the difference between a fine type of *riña* and a very ordinary type. One of them is his recollection of popular heroes and historical events,⁴ which, despite the circumstance that it is used principally as an ironical means of bringing into relief the vanity and the insignificance of the *reñidores*, has the same nationalistic values as the copious allusions to past and present Spanish glories in Lope de Vega and his fellow-writers of the Siglo de Oro. Of a similar nature is his solicitude for local color, which he secures by the mention of the specific names of persons, the use of familiar place-names, the reference to customs and manners of the times, the recalling of natural phenomena that have become popular traditions, as "el año de la langosta," and the like. The pride of family, which stands out as a strong trait among the *pueblo*, adds a typically Spanish note of invidious distinction to squabbles that are permeated with Spanish psychology.⁵ Occasionally a bit of pic-

⁴ Thus, *Teatro*, "Clásicos castellanos," p. 53, "con el serpentino de bronze que en Cartagena está desterrado por su demasiada soberbia, y que bolviesen aora á resucitar las lombardas de hierro colado con quel Cristianísimo rey don Fernando ganó a Baça; y finalmente aquel tan nombrado Galeón de Portugal . . ."; p. 54, "¿Qué más podía dezir aquel valerosísimo español Diego García de Paredes?"; p. 55, "El campo de onze a onze que se hizo en el Piamonte, ¿quién lo acabó sino él é yo?"

⁵ E. g., *Teatro*, "Clásicos castellanos," p. 36, "me dixo en mis barbas que era mejor alcurnea la de los Peñalosas que los Ortizes"; p. 40, "Pues ¿cómo dize la señora Peñalosa que puede ella bivar con mi çapato, siendo

turesqueness, none the less appropriate because it occurs in a *riña*, lends a poetical touch of sentiment to a wrangle and, in a few words, conjures up a Spanish scene, as in "Allí junto a la higuera breval, adonde, si se os acuerda, os di un beso," in *Las aceitunas*.

The significance of such innovations lies in their natural, unforced, artistic realism—a species of realism almost entirely wanting in Rueda's predecessors. The humbleness of the vehicle, namely, the *riña*, not only does not detract from the excellence of Rueda's achievement, but rather heightens it, at the same time strengthening his position as a discerning painter of the people in its most characteristic poses. Were it not for his *riñas* and similar pieces of popular realism, it is possible that some of his more ambitious dramatic efforts might have figured among the neglected plays to which Cañete directed attention in his *Teatro español del siglo XVI*.

Of a presumably lower order of realism from the artistic standpoint—though not necessarily so in the *riña*—are Rueda's favorite comic devices, malapropism (including "spoonerism") and the periphrastic or metaphorical epithet.

A hint of malapropism is to be found in Torres Naharro,⁶ but it is only a hint. Rueda's handling of it is so varied, picturesque, and ubiquitous that the credit for its introduction into Spanish literature, at least, would seem rightfully to belong to him. Certainly, nobody before him had extracted from it so many different kinds of comic effect. Words are mutilated with gay abandon.⁷

todos hijos de Adrián y Estevan?"; p. 104, "Paréscete á boz que dava yo bon xemplo y cuenta de mi linage?"; p. 126, "Ausadas, Mencieta, si tú no me lo pagares, no me tengas por hija de Antón Ramírez Ruiz, Alvarez, Alonso de Pisano, Urefia de Pimentel": Ochoa, *Tesoro del teatro español*, I, Paris, 1838, p. 158, "y que su gervilla valia mas que todo mi linage"; "¿paréscete bien de blasonar de quien vale mas que tu linage . . . ?"; p. 184, "ya saber Dios y tora lo mundo que sar yo la sabrina na reina Berbasino, cuñados de la marques de Cucurucú, por an mar y por an tierras."

⁶ Cf. Böhl von Faber, *op. cit.*, p. 214, martilojo (= martirologio); p. 234, gallo relleno (= Galieno or Galeno); ave roe (= Averroes); ave cena (= Avicena); méficos (= médicos).

⁷ E. g., *Teatro*, "Clásicos castellanos," p. 36, soportativo; p. 37, máscula; p. 102, fazer cudolete; p. 187, infuntos; p. 239, obispeso: Böhl von Faber, *op. cit.*, p. 350, afeitar el vocabro; p. 358, la flor de la cucucena; "Yo, señor, queremos muntipricar á mundos"; p. 361, "Ha visto qué pantasia tiene la cara de sin gorgüenza?"; p. 362, saraguelo; sabuelo; p. 363, carralasolendas; p. 460, respleuto; p. 464, hijo prólogo; hijo pócrito.

Whole scenes are a hodge-podge of jumbled pronunciation, number, gender, and grammatical construction.⁸ Common words are given a coarse or ludicrous twist.⁹ Old, familiar names appear in a comically new form.¹⁰ Logic, as in Cervantes' *vizcaíno* speech, is reversed.¹¹ "Irish bulls" are now and then perpetrated.¹² In short, Rueda systematically practises every known type of linguistic mistake for comic effect and anticipates the better known malapropism and "spoonerism" of Cervantes, Smollett, Sheridan, and Dickens, the first of whom derives directly from him in this respect and the others indirectly, through Cervantes.

The periphrastic or metaphorical epithet that appears so abundantly in Rueda has some affinity in its structure for the periphrasis of the seventeenth century *précieux* in France. Consisting of phrases made up largely of picturesque metaphors employed substantively (e. g., *cantón dencrucijada*, *cucaracha de sótanos*), it has the vivid, artistic value of most metaphor. In the manner of the cartoon, it sketches with swift, economical strokes the physical defects and moral foibles of the victim and carries with it an insinuation of ironical criticism that can not be secured by the ordinary vituperative epithet (*villano*, *bobarón*, *modorón*, *hi de puta*, *don ladrón*, *lacerado*, *bestial*, *bellaco*, *desvergonzado*) forming the stock-in-trade of Juan del Encina, Torres Naharro, Fernando de Rojas, and the other predecessors of Rueda. In addition, it allows the author considerable opportunity for the exercise of

⁸ E. g., the *negra* episodes in the seventh *escena* of the *Eufemia* and the third *escena* of *Los engaños*.

⁹ E. g., *Teatro*, "Clásicos castellanos," p. 105, *cagañeroz*; p. 106, *dueña destabro*: Böhl von Faber, *op. cit.*, p. 299, *un poquito de trementinos de la que llaman de teta* (de puta, in the "Clásicos castellanos" edition of the play).

¹⁰ E. g., *Teatro*, "Clásicos castellanos," p. 40, *siendo todos hijos de Adrián y Estevan*; p. 102, *mi señor Pollos*; p. 103, *señor Nicolás de Tramentinos*: Böhl von Faber, *op. cit.*, p. 369, *Santa Bárbula*.

¹¹ E. g., *Teatro*, "Clásicos castellanos," p. 105, "A otro güesso con aquesse perro, que yo ya la tengo rosegadoz"; p. 107, "Por ciertos que me pesas como si no fueras mi fijo"; "Amarga se vea la madre que le parios."

¹² E. g., *Teatro*, "Clásicos castellanos," p. 43, "si de ocho días que tiene la semana se echa los nueve hecha cuba"; p. 94, "Pues ¿aqueso es carta? Yo por papel lo tenía (a slight, but interesting, anticipation of M. Jourdain's discovery of prose): Ochoa, *op. cit.*, p. 187, "mala landre me mate despues de muerta."

imagination and ingenuity and becomes for him as dramatic a mode of expression as the epigram. Apparently conscious of the advantages of the periphrastic epithet, Rueda reduces the use of the common vituperative epithet to a minimum and replaces it with the highly-colored, concentrated, individualized expression due to his own invention.¹³

From the number of *riñas* in Lope de Rueda and the systematized language in which they are carried on, it is clear that they constitute an important, and not merely a casual, element of his dramaturgy. Their naturalness and spontaneity are to a great extent responsible for the general air of naturalness and spontaneity that emanates from his plays. The perfection with which they reproduce the popular *riñas* of actual life entitles Rueda to a front rank among the many Spanish literary practitioners of the *riña* and billingsgate. The distinction is no mean one.

University of Missouri

J. WARSHAW

THE SOURCES OF *LA FUERZA DEL NATURAL*

La fuerza del natural, a *comedia de figurón*, is one of the more attractive plays of Moreto.¹ In an earlier study,² I had occasion to

¹³ Other examples besides those mentioned above and found scattered through his plays are: *aguja de ensartar matalafes*, *gesto de renacuajo*, *señora desposada por los pesebres*, *ese cucharón de comer gachas*, *molde de bodeques*, *señora chupa de palmito*, *cara de mula*, *pailón de coser* (cocer) *meloxa*, *paramento de bodegón*, *aparejo de caçar abejourucos*, *cara de carbón de brezo*, *cara de esparto por remojar*.

¹ First published in the *Escogidas*, Parte xv, Melchor Sánchez, Madrid, 1661. Here it is attributed to Moreto (without collaborators) in the table of contents, but the concluding lines are:

Y de Cancer y Moreto
fin aquí las plumas dan
probando que en todo sobra
la fuerza del natural.

In the *Segunda parte* (Benito Macé, Valencia, 1676) it is ascribed to Moreto alone:

Y de Moreto los lauros
fin aquí a su pluma dan
probando que en todo sobra
la fuerza del natural.

Of the many *suestras* found in the Biblioteca Nacional, some follow the

show that Mesonero Romanos ignored the matter of chronology when he roundly stated (*BAE.*, XLVII, xxviii) that this work was an imitation of Leyva Ramírez' *Cuando no se aguarda y príncipe tonto*.³ On the contrary there is every reason to believe that Moreto was creditor in this case, not borrower. Nor can I agree that Monroy's "*Mudanzas de la fortuna y firmezas del amor*"⁴ es de asunto parecido al de *La fuerza del natural* de Moreto y Cáncer."⁵ I have read Monroy's play and can not see the similarity indicated. On the other hand, Amescua's *Examinarse de rey* (*Más vale fingir que amar*) and Lope's *La dama boba* offer definite parallels to the work under consideration.⁶

Moreto is in my opinion indebted to Amescua for the thesis

Escogidas, some the *Segunda parte*, in the matter of authorship. In a MS. of the Biblioteca Nacional, which is merely the rôle of the character Julio made for one Francisco Correa in 1668, it is attributed to "Mattos y Cáncer" according to Paz y Melia (*Catálogo*, 1899, 206). The names of "Mattos y Cáncer" are not today found on this manuscript; perhaps an entire page has been lost. Nevertheless, in the third act internal evidence points to the pen of Matos or to some one of similar dramatic methods. See my work *The Dramatic Art of Moreto* (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, XIII, Oct., 1931-July, 1932, Northampton, Mass., 132-133). I have, since making that study, had the opportunity of examining all editions and MSS. of the Nacional. All references in these pages are to the *BAE.*, xxxix.

² See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, 172-173.

³ First published in the *Escogidas*, Parte XL, Julián de Paredes, Madrid, 1675.

⁴ First published in Parte XLI of *Comedias de varios autores*, Valencia, apparently without year or publisher. See La Barrera y Leirado, *Catálogo del teatro antiguo español*, Madrid, 1860, 263. It was written before 1649, since Monroy died in that year. If Cáncer collaborated with Moreto in *La fuerza del natural*, then this play must be placed before 1655, the year of Cáncer's death.

⁵ See Hurtado y Palencia, *Hist. de la lit. esp.*, Madrid, 1921, 705. I do not know the original source of this statement.

⁶ With the second title, Amescua's play was printed in a *suelta* without year or place. I have used in this study a photostat of the manuscript which is to be found in the Biblioteca Nacional (No. 14953) at Madrid. It is entitled *Examinarse de rey*. I should like to express here my thanks to Prof. C. E. Anibal who was so kind as to lend me this photostat. Lope's *La dama boba* was first printed in Parte IX, 1617. I have used Prof. Schevill's edition, *The Dramatic Art of Lope de Vega together with "La dama boba,"* Univ. of Cal. Press, Berkeley, 1918.

"blood will tell" as well as for the general situation.⁷ In both plays when the curtain goes up the two brothers are quarreling, a scene which is interrupted first by the arrival of a comic character and then by that of their father. The latter has come to announce the arrival of their lord (in Moreto's, the Duke of Ferrara and in Amescua's, the King of Naples) who has ostensibly come on a hunt to his country estate. When, however, a few moments later the ruler arrives, we learn that he is come to carry away the son who has been reared in the obscurity of this country village without any knowledge of his kingly heritage.

At this point the stories diverge: in Moreto's play, the father is told that the stupid Julio is his son whereas the "discreet" Carlos is the offspring of the peasant who has reared them; in Amescua's, the ruler finds that the identity of his son Carlos has been confused with that of his illegitimate brother's child (likewise named Carlos) who has been reared in the same home. In both plays the ruler takes the two boys to court where they meet their cousin and become rivals for her hand. From this point on in the story, Amescua concerns himself chiefly with certain psychological tests by which the king and his niece Margarita seek to discover the identity of the true son whereas Moreto fills the remaining two acts of his comedy with the various academic exercises by which the father hopes to sharpen the wits of his stupid son. In both works, it is the peasant who has reared the boy that at the end brings material proofs to corroborate the psychological: just what these are is not made clear in Amescua's play,⁸ but in Moreto's the laborer's wife confesses on her deathbed that she had deceived her husband as to the identity of the two boys and that it is the courtly Carlos (not the boorish Julio) who is son to the Duke. In both plays the prince marries his princess, and the minor characters are paired off at the will of the author.

If the plays are similar in general outline of plot, they differ

⁷ The situation in Amescua's play, as well as the *pruebas* to which the royal father subjects the two boys in order to determine which is his son, recalls Galdos' *El abuelo*, though the democratic dénouement of the modern play would of course have been impossible in the seventeenth century.

⁸ In the photostat which I have used, the last two pages are lacking. This statement is, therefore, based on the résumé of plot which Señor Cotarelo gives. See his *Mira de Amescua y su teatro*, Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," Madrid, 1931, 85-86. For a more detailed résumé of Moreto's than is here given, see *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, 172-173.

widely in other regards. Moreto owes nothing to his predecessor in matters of characterization.⁹ In Amescua's comedy, the real son is frank and sincere in his love, intelligent and just in the exercise of his princely duties whereas his rival, when put to the same tests, proves hypocritical and false, ambitious and tyrannical. In Moreto's work, Carlos is a model of intelligence and "discretion," Julio a comic bumpkin incapable of learning even the most rudimentary demands of polite society.

Moreto, in making this character contrast one of *necedad* versus *discreción*, may have been influenced by Amescua's *gracioso*. Transplanted to the palace along with his masters, Domingo hates the court and longs for the gossip atmosphere of his *aldea*. However, for this contrast of characters, as well as for the scene wherein the dancing master seeks to instruct Julio in the social graces, Moreto is, I doubt not, indebted to Lope's *La dama boba*.¹⁰ One may wonder, though, if *El tonto de la aldea*, mentioned in Lope's first *Peregrino* list, but now lost, may not have been a companion piece to *La dama boba*, and, as such, have furnished a nearer literary parallel than either play mentioned.

If Moreto owes a verbal debt to either Lope or Amescua, I have not noted it. It is perhaps worthwhile to point out a phrase found in *La fuerza del natural* which may have had its origin in *Examinarse de rey*, though it could just as easily be due to coincidence. In Amescua's work one reads (III, 124):

... e aprendido de Carlos
a hacer que las florecillas
canten el nombre de Porzia,
que es *la dama peregrina*.

In Moreto's (I, 208) the term is applied not to the rival, but to the heroine herself,

a quien por su beldad rara
la llaman *la peregrina*.

Moreto's play has in its turn served as source not only for Leyva Ramírez' play but also for Bretón de los Herreros' *El príncipe y el villano*.

RUTH LEE KENNEDY

Smith College

⁹ The laborer who has reared the boys is in both plays upright and loyal, but it was the usual type to be found in the plays of the epoch.

¹⁰ Cf. the spirit of *La fuerza del natural*, II, 218-219 and *La dama boba*, II, 188-189.

FURTHER INFLUENCES OF AUSIAS MARCH ON GUTIERRE DE CETINA

Words and imagery in the poems of Ausias March are known to form the basis of content for thirty-nine of the sonnets, a madrigal, and parts of two *canciones* of Gutierre de Cetina.¹

In addition, students of the Spanish poet cannot fail to see that evidences of his absorption in the work of his fellow-countryman of Valencia pervade many of his other poetic compositions. Such evidences in the longer poems are in the main not consecutive enough, or not sufficiently precise to warrant a drawing up of parallels, but the sonnets, limited by the nature of the form to crystallizations of single leading conceptions, offer opportunity for "rapprochements" more convincing.

Examination shows that when Cetina imitated the Italians (in approximately equal measure as the Catalan), he drew much more extensively on their wording and rhyme-schemes than on those of March, a process partially demanded, or at least strongly suggested by similarity of Italian and Castilian poetic forms of the Renaissance. Very few of the thirty-nine cases of borrowing by Cetina from March betray any approach to complete translation, and in some of them close attention is needed to appreciate the connection that exists. The very pervasiveness of the presence of March with Cetina must therefore be constantly remembered if it appears that some of the comparisons following hold by somewhat slender threads.

The first stanza of the *cant*, *Retinga'm Deu en mon trist pensament*,

Retinga'm Deu en mon trist pensament,
puix que no'm tol ço per que pas tristor,
en ella sent una tan gran dolçor
per si e com altre delit ne sent.
Sens grat seré si jamás la'm despull
e solament assaig d'ella eixir;
tant gran delit me sent d'ella venir
que no desig res fora mi, ne vull.²

¹ See A. M. Withers, *Sources of the Poetry of Gutierre de Cetina*, Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, Philadelphia, 1923.

² Citations from Ausias March are taken from *Les Obres del Valeros*

presents exactly the same idea as Cetina's

Temía hasta aquí de entristecerme,
Cansada ya el alma de un luengo llanto;
Erame hasta aquí visión de espanto
Ver un pesar y no saber valerme.

Mas ahora que vos holgáis de verme
Triste, ningún placer procuro tanto;
Hora me es enojoso el dulce canto
Y alegre aquel que ya solía ofenderme.

Dama, pues de mi bien sois tan esquivia,
Descanso me será cualquier tormento
Que de tan alta causa se deriva;

Pero tengo temor que, de contento,
El rostro, cuando en más tristeza viva,
Muestre al revés señal de lo que siento.²

with just enough similarity of wording to remove the reality of this source from doubt.

Ausias March dwells often and at length on the three kinds of love: the purely fleshly, that in which body and soul accord, and the spiritual or celestial. One is not greatly interested in these days, of course, in the particular subtleties to which discussion of such distinction leads, but the matter did not find Cetina indifferent:

Señora, si es amor, como se entiende,
Deseo de gozar la cosa amada,
De do viene que esta alma enamorada
En el gozo mayor su fuego enciende;

Si tanto dura amor cuanto contiene
Al desear la cosa deseada,
Pues la causa de Amor es ya acabada,
Como dura el efecto y se defiende.

No es amor tal amor; mas desconcierto;
No es el favor el fin de esta porfía,
Aunque muestra ser fin de los amores.

Amor nace del alma; el alma es cierto
Que en parte es voluntad, y así la mía
Desea la voluntad; no los favores.

Cavaller y elegantissim poeta Ausias March (etc.), Barcelona, Biblioteca Clásica Catalana, 1908-1909.

² *Obras de Gutierre de Cetina*, ed. J. Hazañas y la Rúa, Sevilla, 1895, two volumes. The sonnets are placed here alphabetically according to the opening lines.

The Spanish poet chose some of his wording apparently from *Sens lo desig de cosa deshonestà*, stanza 3:

No cessarà lo meu igual talent
 Puix mou de part que no's cansa ne's farta,
 car l'esperit tot lo finit aparta,
no es en cors lo seu contentament;
De vos deman la voluntat guanyada,
cella qui es en l'arma infinida;
 la part d'amor que pot esser partida,
 en lo meu cor no hi es molt esforçada.

Compare also with Cetina's second quatrain Stanza 3, lines 6-8, of *Ja tots mos cants me plau metr' en oblít*:

car fermetat en ell no pot haver,
 puix no es pus que destemprat voler
 e dura tant com la passió'l guia.

Similar professions of zeal for the more elevated passions of love, the "good desire," form the matter of the following sonnet, in which the poet accomplishes a "tour de force" in rhyme peculiar to this sonnet alone of his repertoire:

Oh noche, para mi muy claro día,
 Que enriqueciste tanto el buen deseo,
 Que en siempre desear lo que deseo
 Faltar será imposible en algún día!
 Y tú, que tu presencia es siempre día,
 No tomes por ofensa mi deseo;
 Que sólo por loarte lo deseo
 Y con esto acabar mi postrer día.
 Y pues tal ha de ser mi pensamiento
 En este desear, que la esperanza
 Al vano imaginar quite su oficio,
 Siendo tan puro y limpio el pensamiento,
 No niegues este bien; que otra esperanza
 Más del vivir no quiero en este oficio.

That not more similarities of wording are apparent in the following of March, may well be explained by the exigencies of rhyme which the Spanish poet set for himself.

Estramps 1, Fantasiant amor a mi descobre
 los grans secrets qu'als pus subtils amaga,
e mon jorn clar als homens es nit fosca
 e visch d'aço que persones no tasten.

Tant en amor l'esperit meu contempla
 que par del tot fora del cos se aparte,
 car mos desigs no son trobats en home,
 sino en tal que la carn punt no'l torbe.

The sonnet seems to have been suggested by the third verse of the Catalan. "Jorn clar" is here more a mental concept than a period of time, the idea which Cetina's "claro día" approaches. For both poets, however, it is an identical question of the inspiration of high desires, insuring clarity of mind and spiritual exaltation.

Two more sources for Cetina's sonnets, to be added to one already discovered there,⁴ are found in March, *Cert es de mi que no me'n cal fer compte*, in which the lover admits the force of the earthly elements in love, whose occasional victories in the inner conflict lie heavy on his soul. The second stanza,

Tant com en mi es y fou soportable
 de contrastar e vendre la batalla
 yo he complit dins mi sentint baralla,
 tal que no'm fou un altre comparable.
Yo desig tant com lo cor me soporta
 e per aquest desig a mi hayre,
 puix la que am ab grat e desgrat mire
 torbat me sent, costum passat no'm porta.
 Yo am e'm dolch conexent mi que ame,
 d'ella'm delit, e més com la desame.

supplied part of the metaphorical language for Cetina's

Contra el influjo del contrario cielo,
 Que a nuestra voluntad cegar porfia
 Ha andado trabajando el alma mía
 Por defendella de amoroso velo.
 Y no bastando aquel divino celo
 Con que me ha desviado y me desvía,
Pudo en el cuerpo más su fantasía,
 Como en cosa compuesta acá en el suelo.
 No debe el alma ser reprehendida,
 Pues libre sin lesión ninguna queda
 Y sola la mortal parte ofendida.
 Ni basta aquella que nos vuelve en rueda
 Por ser elementada nuestra vida
 Que contra el cielo defendella pueda.

⁴ *The Sources of the Poetry of Gutierre de Cetina*, p. 79.

and the twelfth stanza

Yo creguí ferm que sentir no poguera
 en mi amor ne'n la persona amada,
 ne per la carn l'hagués tant desijada
 no imaginant qu'en ser amat venguera.
 Un gest mostrant dona ficta honesta
 e sentiment practicant d'amor acte
 sens recelar ha fet en mi fals tracte
 prenint me'l cor, e part alguna resta.
 La que roman té ocupada yra,
 e quan se mou tot quant so a si'm tira.

contains the necessary similarity of words and idea to stand as the source for Cetina's

Yo, Señora, pensaba, antes creía,
 Mas ¡ay! que no sabía lo que pensaba,
 Que era amado el que amaba y no entendía
 Que el hado a mi porfía contrastaba.
 El Amor me engañaba y me decía
 Que la fe que os tenía se pagaba;
 Pero si ciego andaba y no la vía
 La justa opinión mía se engañaba.
 Ya el temor me muestra el desengaño,
 Si el gusto del engaño consintiera
 Que apartarme pudiera de mi daño.
 Mas el mayor engaño, ¡ay suerte fiera!
 Es que aunque claro viera que era engaño,
 Por un bien tan extraño el mal quisiera.

Cetina has three sonnets describing the physical effects upon the lover of love's first assault, or of any unexpected apparition of the lady to her lover's sight. The idea is common enough in petrarchan poetry, but the sonnet

Cuando del grave golpe es ofendido
 El cuerpo, de improviso lastimado,
 O por nuevo accidente es asaltado
 Por caso de que no fué prevenido,
La sangre corre luego al desvalido
Corazón, como a miembro señalado,
Y de allí va a parar do el golpe ha dado,
 De do nace el quedar descolorido.
 Hizo en mi pecho Amor mortal herida;
 Corrió luego la sangre allí alterada
 Y separóse de do estaba el daño.
De allí quedó con la color perdida:

Al rostro el corazón se la ha usurpado
Para favorecer su mal extraño.

certainly derives from March, *Tot entenent amador mi entenga*,⁵
stanza 28:

Lla donchs lo foch d'amor bé no s'amaga
e los meus ulls publich lo manifesten,
e les dolors mon sanch al cor arresten,
acorrent lla hon es donada plaga.

Los meus desigs de punt en punt cambie
e la dolor no es en un lloch certa,
ma cara es de su color incerta;
cerch lochs secrets e los publichs desvie.

Llanç me'n lo lit, dolor me'n gita fora,
cuyt esclatar mentre mon ull no plora.

Finally Cetina amplifies March, *Per molt amor mi vida es en dubte*, stanza 1,

Per molt amar mi vida es en dubte,
mas no cregau que de la mort me tema;
a poch a poch ma esperança es sema
e 'm vol fugir, mas no 'u fa en orrubte.
Haja mal grat de sa compassio,
puix no'm serveix a mon affany guarir,
lo detardar no veda lo venir
e creix desig e dobla 'm passio.

for his sonnet,

Huyendo va la trabajosa vida
Del cansado vivir que no la quiere,
Y el alma, de contenta en ver que muere
De sus males, no acierta a dar salida.
La esperanza cansada, embebecida,
Tras un bien que será más mal si fuere,
Viendo que falta ya fuerza en que espere,
A los pies del dolor queda rendida.
Poco puede tardar el bien que espero:
Si el curso natural se ha detenido,
Acabará el dolor tantos enojos.
Ya siento yo la muerte, y si no muero,
Es que quiere el dolor, que me ha vencido,
Poco a poco gozar de los despojos.

⁵ Cetina selected another stanza of this poem for a much closer reproduction. See *The Sources of the Poetry of Gutierre de Cetina*, p. 67.

The foregoing evidences of Cetina's reading in March for materials utilized in seven of his sonnets (without exhausting the subject) extend the known total of his indebtedness to this source, as far as the sonnets are concerned, to forty-six, taken from thirty-four *cants* of the Catalan.

We cannot but wonder where another such case of wholesale adaptation of a poet's work could be found. Certainly the borrowing of material for more than a third of his entire sonnet repertory (counting also his Italian sources) by a poet of the justified renown of Gutierre de Cetina, is a striking phenomenon in the world of letters.

A. M. WITHERS

Concord State Teachers College

HARTZENBUSCH Y LEMMING, *EL ECO DE MADRID*

Existe en la biblioteca del Colegio de Charleston, radicado en Charleston, Carolina del Sur, un ejemplar de *El eco de Madrid* por Hartzenbusch y Lemming.¹ Hasta la fecha no tengo conocimiento de que exista otro ejemplar en los Estados Unidos, y ni siquiera aparece en los manuales de bibliografía española.

El libro nos presenta un nuevo aspecto de la actividad literaria de Don Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch. Le conocemos como crítico, dramaturgo, bibliófilo, académico, etc., pero en este volumen se nos revela como pedagogo, interesado en la preparación de un manual para la difusión de su lengua materna entre los extranjeros y particularmente entre "los compatriotas de mi padre."² De esta alusión se deduce que probablemente la edición original fué preparada para estudiantes de nacionalidad alemana, aunque la edición que tengo a la vista es sin duda una adaptación para estudiantes de nacionalidad inglesa, toda vez que está provista de

¹ *El eco de Madrid o sea curso práctico de la buena conversación española, principiado y dirigido por D. Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch, Director que fué de la Biblioteca Nacional y continuado por D. Enrique Lemming, Profesor de idiomas alemán e inglés que fué en la Universidad de Madrid.* Un volumen en 12mo., publicado por la editorial de Wilhem Violet, quinta edición, Leipzig, 1891. Páginas, x, 144, 84, ejercicios y vocabulario numerados separadamente.

² *Ibid.*, Véase el prólogo.

un vocabulario español-inglés. Además el anuncio de la casa editorial incluido en el libro hace referencia a *Ecos* para "alemanes, franceses, ingleses, holandeses, y otros."

La bibliografía de las obras de Hartzenbusch preparada por su hijo³ menciona este libro en la sección de prólogos en estos términos: "Prólogo al *Eco de Madrid o sea curso práctico de la buena conversación española*. Leipzig, 1858." (*Ibid.*, p. 412.) Esta referencia es prueba evidente de que Hartzenbusch Ixart tenía conocimiento de la existencia de esta obra, y de la publicación de la que juzgo sea la primera edición en 1858. Adviértase, sin embargo, que solamente le atribuye el prólogo a su padre, y nada más dice de la colaboración de éste. Lo cierto es que ha debido consignar que su padre es coautor y no mero prologador y darnos alguna luz sobre la pieza dramática que, según este prólogo, escribió precisamente Hartzenbusch para dicho libro. Este hecho acusa ignorancia de parte de Don Eugenio en cuanto a las proporciones de la participación de su padre, y lo que es más, la posibilidad de que ni siquiera hubiese leído el prólogo, pues de lo contrario hubiera tomado nota de esta pieza y de las trece páginas de ejercicios con que, según reza el prólogo, contribuyera Don Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch.

El estudio de esta pieza dramática sugiere varios problemas. En primer lugar tenemos la fecha de la primera aparición. Hartzenbusch al referirse en el prólogo a este dramita, como él le llama, dice que fué "ya antes impreso," lo cual indica que había sido publicado antes de 1858, ya bien en alguna revista, o en algún volumen de Hartzenbusch hasta ahora desconocido. El caso es que no he podido encontrar ningún indicio de la fecha exacta de su primera aparición. También hay la posibilidad de que esta pieza apareciese bajo otro título. Examinemos el argumento para ver lo que hay en cuanto a esto. Se trata de una joven, Pepita, que ha recibido una carta de un pretendiente hacia quien no siente inclinación alguna. Dos amigas vienen a pasar un rato de charla con ella, y en el curso de la conversación hablan de sus desdichas e infortunios. Todo lo atribuyen a haber rechazado al joven en cuestión cuando éste las pretendía. Pepita empieza a recapacitar sobre su decisión, pero aun así, no puede determinarse. Este

³ Eugenio Hartzenbusch Ixart, *Bibliografía de Hartzenbusch*, Madrid, 1900.

dilema lo resuelve la llegada de una carta de otra amiga, en la cual dice haber sufrido un accidente muy desgraciado. Esta joven también ha rehusado casarse con el pretendiente de marras. Pepita acepta inmediatamente, lo comunica al joven por medio de una señal convenida, y un loro cierra el dramita de esta suerte:

Y sin más pormenores
Del casamiento
Aquí acaba, lectores,
El drami-cuento. (p. 90)

Como puede verse, la pieza no es más que una especie de sainetito o juguete cómico. Hartzenbusch lo caracteriza de esta suerte: "Dramicuento a galope; es decir que la acción va corre-que-te-cojo" (p. 89).

Los manuales de bibliografía española no hacen referencia a ninguna pieza dramática de Hartzenbusch titulada *Querer de miedo*. Sólo ocurre un título que a primera vista pudiera sugerir alguna relación, *El casamiento por fuerza*. Sin embargo, la semejanza entre estos títulos es demasiado distante para deducir que ambos pertenezcan a la misma pieza. Según Don Eugenio Hartzenbusch Ixart (*op. cit.*, p. 134), *El casamiento por fuerza* es uno de los títulos incluídos en una lista de las obras de su padre que le suministró Fernández Guerra, y según éste es una traducción de *Le mariage forcé* de Molière. De esta traducción nada más se sabe, pues no existen ejemplares de ella. Ante estos hechos, sólo cabe la conclusión de que *Querer de miedo* es una composición independiente, y como tal debe aparecer en cualquier bibliografía de Don Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch que pretenda ser completa.

JOSÉ MIGUEL GALLARDO

College of Charleston

REFERENCE TO THE FACE IN FRENCH DRAMA BEFORE RACINE

G. Le Bidois¹ held that textual reference by a character to emotions or thoughts reflected by his own facial expression or by that of another character was a device distinctive of Racine, but it has been shown to occur in the drama of antiquity and in that

¹ *De l'Action dans la tragédie de Racine*, Paris, Poussielgue, 1900, Ch. iv.

of La Calprenède.² Its use can also be demonstrated in French drama before the latter author wrote.

Religious and moral instruction of the illiterate explains in large measure the naïveté, exaggerated horror and tearfulness of medieval serious drama.³ Facial expression is used in these plays to reflect gross emotions or physical states and sometimes as a *décor* for the mind. The more usual type of allusion is a simple physical description, as in the case of an entering character: "Je vous voy com toute esbahie."⁴ Divine punishment is emphasized by facial disfigurement, as seen in the sudden death of a wicked queen, whose beauty "ne fait qu'obscurcir, Ni son viaire que noircir." The moral character of this death is made clear by showing that the blackness cannot be due to a soiled floor:

Comment li peut estre la face,
Pour cheoir en si belle place,
Ne le corps devenu si noir?⁵

The extensive and somewhat haphazard use of tears⁶ and other gross devices does not preclude the use of visual portrayal of mental actions which direct the intrigue. The battle of wills between the peasant queen Grisélidis and her husband is so presented; the king

La regarde moult longuement
Mais jamaiz un seul mouvement
Ne un seul semblant de tristee
Il n'y trovast.⁷

After placing assassins in the cellar, a woman "puts on a face" so as to make her son-in-law go for wine:

La malade faire me fault . . .
Le chief enclin me veil tenir
Et clos les yex.⁸

² Cf. M. Baudin, *MLN.*, XLVIII, 50 and XLV, 114.

³ Cf. Lintilhac, *Histoire générale du théâtre en France*, I, Ch. I.

⁴ *Miracle d'Oston, roy d'Espagne*, 1169.

⁵ *Miracle de Thierry*, 774-75, 802-04. For other examples, cf. *Amis et Amille* (leprosy) and *Robert le dyable* (insanity).

⁶ Cf. *Amis et Amille*, 176-77 (sorrow), 983-84 (fear), 1126 (relief). 1580-81 (joy). Tears are also a mark of sincere repentance; Jesus intercedes for Oston because of his visibly apparent contrition "qui de lermes moule sa face" (1538. Cf. also *Clovis*, 1768-71).

⁷ *Grisélidis* (cf. Lintilhac, *op. cit.*, p. 288).

⁸ *Miracle de Une Femme que Nostre Dame garda d'estre arse*, 276-79.

In Bodel's *Jus de Saint Nicholai*, the action is determined by the facial expression of the idol, Tervagan. The Saracen king, hearing of the Christian invasion, asks for a sign:

Si je doi gaagnier, si ri;
Et si je doi perdre, si pleure.
Seneschal, que vous est avis?
Tervagan a plouré et ris.

The seneschal interprets the double sign of the idol and the action develops according to his interpretation. At the end of the play, he recalls the truth of the idol's sign.⁹

The use of the face in Renaissance tragedy reflects the transitional nature of the genre, for, alongside of medieval references horrible or lacrymose in nature, we find scenes of subtle face-reading and of highly psychological action. Garnier often used elements of stark horror,¹⁰ but he managed to use stock descriptions with more discrimination than his predecessors. Phèdre's fiery passion is portrayed differently from ordinary romantic love ("... La couleur vous abaisse"): ¹¹

Hélas! vous voyez bien par mon visage blême,
Par ma palle maigreur qu'ardemment ie vous aime.¹²

He makes another advance in introducing misinterpretation. Thésée, by misjudging Hippolyte's expression, brings on the catastrophe:

Ce triste forestier, ce chasseur solitaire . . .
D'un visage rassis sentant sa maïesté,
D'un pudique regard, d'un sourci venerable,
A le cœur impudent, lascif, abominable. (IV)

In *La Troade*, Ulysse, sent to fetch Astyanax, sees through Andromache's story of her son's death:

. . . elle pleure, gemist,
Se tourne çà et là, la face luy blesmit,
Elle cuide escouter, bref elle a plus de crainte
Que son ame ne semble estre de dueil atteinte. (II)

⁹ For other examples of facial expression determining the action, cf. *Amis et Amille*, 652-57 and *Thierry*, 112-15.

¹⁰ Cf. *Cornelie*, III (1574), *Marc Antoine*, V (1578), *la Troade*, V (1579), *Antigone*, III (1580), *les Iuifues*, V (1583).

¹¹ *Bradamante*, III, 1 (1582).

¹² *Hippolyte*, III (1573). The nurse, however, has described Phèdre's love in terms of changing color.

As he tells of the fate intended for Astyanax, he sees his suspicions verified by Andromache's expression: "... ie luy voy le visage muer." (II) ¹³

Hardy made wide, though generally undeveloped use of the face, basing actions on face-readings,¹⁴ presenting "scènes de regards" ¹⁵ and employing other established uses of the device.¹⁶ His notable contribution was his development of description of entering characters. When Araspe enters to explain his attentions to Panthée, his feelings are strikingly visualized; he is "palissant où de crainte où d'amour." ¹⁷ In another case, the catastrophe is foretold by the messenger's face:

... que vois-je avancer?
Et ses yeux égarez deçà delà lancer? ¹⁸

Such use of facial expression clarifies and shortens the scene to follow.

The restriction of physical action imposed by the classical doctrine shifted emphasis to psychological action, thus clearing the way for use of the face as a *décor d'âme*. As early as Mairet's *Sophonisbe* (1634), we find characters who are fully aware of each other's facial expression; Sophonisbe knows how one may be betrayed by one's face:

Certes autant de fois que mon ame insensée
A voulu s'arrester dessus ceste pensée,
Nourrice, autant de fois i'ay changé de couleur,
Et mes sens interdits ont montré ma douleur. (I, 3)

It is not surprising, therefore, to find her reading Massinisse's face as astutely as she subsequently does.¹⁹ Rotrou consistently used the face to express conflict of wills. The quarrel between Ménélas and Agamemnon begins with an examination of faces:

¹³ For other varied uses of the face, cf. Garnier's *les Iuifues*, Jodelle's *Cléopâtre* (1552) and *Didon* (1559), Grévin's *César* (1560), Rivaudeau's *Aman* (1561), Bounin's *Soltane* (1562).

¹⁴ Cf. *Alceste*, I, 2 (1610-20).

¹⁵ Cf. *Félicisme*, III (1615-25).

¹⁶ Cf. *Panthée*, v, 1, 2 (1605-15), *Méléagre*, v, 2 (*ibid.*), *Didon se sacrifiant*, I, 2; III, 1; v, 1 (*ibid.*), *Dorise*, III, 1 (1620-25).

¹⁷ *Panthée*, III, 1.

¹⁸ *Coriolan*, v, 3 (1605-15). Cf. *La Mort d'Alexandre*, II, 1 (*ibid.*).

¹⁹ IV, 1. Cf. also I, 2; III, 2; IV, 2; v, 5. Compare with *Chryséide et Arimand* (1625), in which there is frequent allusion to the face, but without finesse, owing to the emphasis on incident of the old type tragicomedy.

—Repondez à mes yeux d'un regard seulement,
Et de là mon discours prendra son fondement.
—Croyez-vous que la peur m'ait interdit la vue? ²⁰

In *Bélisaire*,²¹ Théodore prepares to watch Antonie's face when the latter meets Bélisaire. Théodore warns her that it will mean Bélisaire's death

. . . si par quelque signe ou public ou secret,
Par quelque mouvement de joie ou de regret,
Vous rendez votre amour visible à Bélisaire. (I, 4)

The strain of the meeting is so great that Antonie's self-control wavers, whereupon Théodore commands: ". . . tiens cette vue abaissée." (I, 6)²² Both Rotrou and Du Ryer portrayed soul-struggle on the face. Despite Agamemnon's effort to hide his inner struggle over the question of the sacrifice of Iphigénie, the truth is read on his face by Clytemnestre.²³ In another play, a murderer is betrayed by his "maintien interdit" and his "visage effrayé."²⁴ The agony of Saul's struggle against fate is visualized:

Abner, en vain le roi veut monstrier son courage,
La douleur de l'esprit éclatte en son visage.²⁵

By rapid reference to the face, Corneille frequently softened characters without detracting from their heroism. Emilie's femininity breaks through, following Cinna's departure:

Il va vous obéir aux dépens de sa vie:
Vous en pleurez! ²⁶

We are shown that Polyeucte's earthly ties have not been completely severed, as Pauline says: ". . . il s'émeut, je vois couler des larmes."²⁷ Corneille also gave misinterpretation a new turn by having a character "put on a face" to bring about a mistaken impression. Judging by her tears, Cléopâtre seems to have recanted. Her soliloquy, however, enlightens us: "Si je verse des

²⁰ *Iphigénie en Aulide*, II, 2 (1640); these speeches are also found in Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*.

²¹ Published 1643.

²² Cf. Racine, *Britannicus*, I, 3, 5, 6.

²³ *Iphigénie*, III, 2 and IV, 3.

²⁴ *Polyeucte*, IV, 3 (1641-42). Cf. *Le Cid*, IV, 1, 5 (1637) and *Horace*, II, 5; III, 5 (1640).

²⁵ *Venceslas*, IV, 6 (1648).

²⁶ *Saül*, IV, 1 (Du Ryer, 1639).

²⁷ *Cinna*, III, 5 (1640-41).

pleurs, ce sont des pleurs de rage."²⁸ Tristan l'Hermite's *Mariane*²⁹ delineates the entire struggle of Salome and her brother against Mariane on the face. Herod sends Pherore to Mariane with explicit instructions to watch her face.³⁰ Salome instructs the Echanson to think of the false evidence as if it were true, and then: "Laisse agir là dessus ta langue et ton visage." (II, 3) This evidence leads to Herod's fatal misinterpretation; he imagines Mariane's reaction to be one of guilt, on seeing the Echanson: "Désia l'apperceuant, elle rougist de honte." (III, 2)³¹

We have seen that allusion to facial expression varied in effectiveness with the use and development of psychological characterization. Inasmuch as the classical doctrine directed emphasis to such delineation of character, it is no more than reasonable to expect the finest facial pictures to occur in the works of Racine. In view, however, of the extent and variety of the examples of allusion to the face before Racine, it cannot be maintained that the device was original with any one man; like most dramatic devices, it evolved with the drama.

PHILLIP TYKULSKER

New York University

PIERRE GROGNET AND *LES MÉLANCHOLIES* OF JEHAN DU PIN

The *Mélancholies* (title of the last "Book" of the *Roman de Mandevie*)¹ of Jehan Du Pin (1340), we find curiously abridged in the *Second Volume des Motz Dorez du Grand et Saige Cathon* (1533) of Pierre Grognet (or Grosnet). The varied contents of this volume have been noted by F. Lachèvre,² who has succeeded in identifying a number of the authors reproduced by Grognet, though he admits there still remains much to be done. However, M. Lachèvre makes one error which we venture to correct here. On p. 28 he gives an analysis of folios 123-131 of Grognet, naming each piece (they are in verse) and giving the number of verses in each one.³ We have 24 pieces here, and the headings of each one are

²⁸ *Rodogune*, IV, 4 (1644-45). Cf. *Nicomède*, I, 3, 5 (1650-51).

²⁹ 1636.

³⁰ I, 3.

³¹ Cf. also II, 2, 6, 7; IV, 1; V, 1, 3.

¹ Cf. *MLN.*, May, 1935.

² In *Bibliographie des recueils collectifs de poésie du 16^e siècle*, p. 26.

³ M. Lachèvre categorically attributes these pages to Grognet himself.

taken, word for word, and in the same order, from the table of contents which precedes the *Mélancholies*.⁴ The pieces in question deal with 24 "états du monde," ranging from the pope to the "vilain." M. Lachèvre reproduces the first line of each piece, which lines are found, in almost every case, in the *Mélancholies*. As I have not been able to consult Grognet's volume, I cannot tell what changes he made (except abridgments) in Du Pin's text—except in one case: Montaignon, in his *Anciennes Poésies Françaises*, VII, 70, reprinted from Grognet the 22 stanzas entitled *Des Villains, villeniers, vilnastres et doubles villains*. This, compared with the chapter in the *Mélancholies* entitled *Sur l'Estat dez Villains*,⁵ shows that Grognet took the piece almost bodily from Du Pin. The latter's work is in "sixains" while Grognet's is in quatrains. Here is a good example of Grognet's alterations:

Du Pin	Grognet
Le villain parfait de nature	Ung villain parfaict de nature
Ne creut uncques en l'escripture	Ne creust oncques en l'Escripture
"Croyes" fait il en cellez peaulx	Il dit que ce ne sont que peaulx,
He Dieu! com male norreture!	Dont n'est pas digne des pourceaulx.
Cil qu'est de si faulse nature	
Doit morir avec les pourceaulx."	

Many of Grognet's merely verbal changes are doubtless due to the fact that he was following either a later ms. than our 451 (1411) or one of the incunabulum editions of the *Mandevie*, later versions in which the editors and scribes changed the text to conform to contemporary usage.

A DISSUATION ET REMÈDE DES SEPT PECHES MORTELZ (folios 100-104 of the *Motz Dorez*) attributed (with a question-mark) to Grognet by M. Lachèvre is likewise taken from Book 8 of the *Mandevie*, where it occupies folios 116 recto to 128 recto of ms. 451.

Folios 91-97 of the *Motz Dorez* are devoted to DES LOUENGES, EXCELLENS ET PROPRIETÉZ DES SEPT ARS LIBERAULX, which are, perhaps, inspired by Du Pin's work. (Cf. fol. 6 verso sq. of ms. 451). But Du Pin himself took that from Gautier de Metz' rhymed translation of the *Imago Mundi* of Honoré d'Autun. (Cf. BN Ms. f. fr. 1822, p. 150).

ROBERT E. PIKE

The Principia College, Elmhurst, Ill.

⁴ Bibl. Nat. Ms. f. fr. 451, folio 89 recto.

⁵ *Ibid.*, folio 112 recto sq.

WASHINGTON IRVING AS A SOURCE FOR BOREL
AND DUMAS

Among the prolific writings of the elder Dumas, *La Femme au Collier de Velours* affords an interesting example of literary indebtedness which has apparently gone unnoticed. In spite of its elaborate setting this weird story, published in 1850,¹ has its immediate source in the work of Pétrus Borel. Among the latter's work, scattered through reviews and journals but never reprinted, is a story called "Gottfried Wolfgang," published² in Paris in 1843.

In the only adequate biography of this little-known French Romanticist, Aristide Marie³ protests indignantly against so flagrant a case of plagiarism. Though this story is not included in the only edition of Borel's collected works,⁴ the editor praises it highly and devotes four pages⁵ of his biography to a discussion of it. He is particularly incensed that Dumas should have been able to dupe the public with a fantastic setting, some new names, and a liberal dilution of a splendid story.

Having rebuked Dumas and restored to Borel the honor of literary ownership, the biographer asks,

N'est-ce pas à son ami Gérard de Nerval, dont le premier internement eut lieu en 1841, que songe ici Pétrus Borel? Cette réminiscence s'affirme assez bien lorsqu'il nous montre son héros hanté par le souvenir d'une femme d'une beauté merveilleuse, aperçue en rêve, et dont la vision le poursuit d'un inguérissable regret (138).

It is accordingly amusing to discover that "Gottfried Wolfgang" is an exact translation of Washington Irving's "The Adventure of the German Student." Borel not only took over the entire story but even included, somewhat misspelled, an English quotation

¹ H. P. Thieme, *Bibliographie de la Littérature Française de 1800 à 1930*, I, 637.

² *Sylphide*. Littérature, beaux-arts, modes, 4^{me} série, VIII, 331-334.

³ Aristide Marie, *P. Borel, Le Lycanthrope, Sa vie et son œuvre*. La Force Française, Paris, 1922

⁴ Pétrus Borel, *Œuvres Complètes*, ed. par Aristide Marie, La Force Française, Paris, 1921, 2 vols.

⁵ Aristide Marie, *P. Borel*, 137-141. In Mario Praz's *Romantic Agony* (1933, p. 134) this story is mentioned as an important tale of Borel's "worthy of Poe."

from Fletcher's *Wife for a Month*, which Irving had placed at the beginning of his *Tales of a Traveller*. The title "Gottfried Wolfgang" is the character's name in Irving's story. Borel simply pre-faced this tale with a brief introduction concerning a melancholy young Englishman who had left the manuscript with an innkeeper at Boulogne. While Irving ended the story in typical Knickerbocker fashion by destroying the atmosphere of gloom and terror, Borel, whose literary stock-in-trade was crime and the shedding of blood, maintains this mood.⁶

WALTER A. REICHART

University of Michigan

REVIEWS

The Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth (1787-1805). Edited by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1935. Pp. xviii + 578. \$8.75.

Wordsworth's Anti-climax. By WILLARD L. SPERRY, Dean of the Harvard Divinity School. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. x + 228. \$2.50. (Harvard Studies in English, XIII.)

"Wordsworth's Aesthetic Development, 1795-1802." By O. J. CAMPBELL and P. MUESCHKE. In *Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1933. Pp. 1-57. (University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature, x.)

For some years the letters of Wordsworth and his sister have been not merely out of print but unprocurable, and many a scholar has wondered what he should do if a volume of the only set available to him were lost. But if it was impossible for the Wordsworth specialist to work without the Knight edition—the only one approaching completeness,—it was equally impossible for him to

⁶ It will be recalled that Irving received the suggestion for the story from Thomas Moore, who had originally heard it from Horace Smith. See *Journal of Washington Irving (1823-24)*, ed. by S. T. Williams, Cambridge, Mass., 1931, p. 213 and *Memoirs, Journals, and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, ed. by Lord John Russell, London, 1853, iv, 208.

work confidently with it, since it was known to be both fragmentary and inaccurate. The extent and the frequency of Knight's omissions have not, however, been suspected: the complete suppression of some letters, the printing of as little as one twenty-fifth of others, and the excision even in a note to Scott of over a third of the whole. There are four mistakes and four unindicated omissions in eight lines of Dorothy's letter of May 6, 1792, and eighteen omissions amounting to nearly six and a half pages (two-thirds of the whole) from her letter of September 10, 1800. Of the eighteen cuts just referred to, twelve were made without any hint to the reader, and in one case a word in the middle of a sentence in a postscript is made to begin a paragraph in the body of the letter! Some of the passages dropped are quite as interesting as those retained; indeed, the three pages deleted from the poet's letter to Coleridge of Christmas, 1799, are among the best in the correspondence.¹ As a result, the first volume of Professor de Selincourt's eagerly-expected edition contains three times as much material as Knight printed for the same years: 241 letters as against Knight's 142, filling 562 large pages as against Knight's smaller and more loosely printed 273. Not all of this, however, is new; for extensive, though by no means invariably complete, quotations from Dorothy's previously unpublished correspondence were given in Professor de Selincourt's biography of 1933. Of the material here first made available, the greater part deals with money matters or with the details of every-day life which are of little general interest. The most significant of the new letters are those of March 5, 1798 and December, 1798 (or January, 1799), which give early versions of "The Ruined Cottage," "She dwelt among," "Strange fits of passion," "Nutting," and of the skating and borrowed-boat passages later included in *Prelude* I. Here "Nutting" has the animistic lines, "They led me far, Those guardian spirits"; "She dwelt among" is two stanzas longer and much less effective; but "Strange fits of passion" has a final stanza which unifies and gives meaning and pathos to an otherwise ineffectual poem. The piece now ends:

"O mercy!" to myself I cried,
"If Lucy should be dead!"

Originally there was one more stanza:

I told her this; her laughter light
Is ringing in my ears;
And when I think upon that night
My eyes are dim with tears.

¹ Professor de Selincourt neglects to mention that long extracts from the original draft of this letter were published in Christopher Wordsworth's *Memoirs* (I. 149-54) and in Grosart (III. 238-42). In *TLS* for September 12 and October 3, 1935, Catherine M. Maclean calls attention to six early letters of Dorothy's which are omitted, notes that the MSS. of letters 143 and 174 are in the British Museum, and suggests that 180, which is important for *The Prelude*, was written in 1806.

Professor de Selincourt, though he is well aware of them, calls attention to none of these points. As in the case of his notable edition of *The Prelude*, the only criticism to be made of his comments is that they are too few. He says little about the correspondents—it is curious how much less we know, and how much less we care, about them than about the men to whom Keats wrote; he writes no introduction, gives very few cross-references, does not disentangle the baffling financial transactions which fill the letters to Richard Wordsworth, and does not inform us as to the present location of each letter.

Perhaps he has grown somewhat weary of his long task; for, although this volume covers the poet's great years (through the completion of *The Prelude*), it contains few really excellent letters. No one who felt as Wordsworth did about Personal Talk and who shrank from the use of a pen as he did was likely to be an attractive correspondent. Yet there are many more good things in his letters than is commonly supposed.² Strangely enough, the delicate observation of nature which marks his sister's journals is rarely found in her letters. These, although garrulous and tending to the commonplace, are always natural (which her brother's frequently are not) and give an unrivalled picture of the daily life of the poet and his family.

Dean Sperry has written an interesting and often admirable book; yet his major thesis, that the inferior quality of Wordsworth's later poetry is due to his esthetic theory, is unconvincing. All the evidence we have goes to disprove the assumption here made that "in the poems by which he is remembered . . . he worked in sight of his system and with an eye fixed steadily upon it" (p. 140). Dean Sperry's own system has come between him and the keen insight into Wordsworth's character that he usually reveals. For, as Dorothy wrote Mrs. Clarkson (March 27, 1821), "the will never governs his labours" and, as Miss Fenwick lamented, "he can do but as the spirit moves him" (*Correspondence of Henry Taylor*, 1888, p. 110). Nor is it true that "by his theories of art. . . . He is denied classicism" (pp. 139-40)—witness "Laodamia," "Dion," and "To Lycoris"—that "He is self-exiled from both epic and dramatic themes"—witness those mentioned in *Prelude*, i. 166-233—that "He is confined to the simplest subjects"—witness *The White Doe*, "Ode, Intimations of Immortality," and *The Prelude* (the subject of which is the imagination as that of his work as a whole is "the Mind of Man")—that in autobiographical poems he is "required to look with suspicion upon present joys" and is "ideally to allow a lapse of many years between . . . experience and . . . poetic creation"—wit-

² Few of his early letters have been preserved: only one before 1791 (the year he met Annette) and only 19 before June, 1797; for '92, '93, and '95 the total is 3!

ness "Tintern Abbey," "The Cock is crowing," "Composed upon Westminster Bridge," the Calais sonnets, "Extempore Effusion," and the *Yarrow Revisited* volume, all of which and many more were composed immediately after the experience they celebrate. No, Wordsworth was not the slave of a system.

Dean Sperry considers other explanations that have been advanced for the early decline of Wordsworth's powers and answers sanely and dispassionately the theory of Herbert Read and Hugh Fausset that remorse for his treatment of Annette was responsible. In his discussion of the part played by the loss of Coleridge's friendship he is less convincing. He gives the impression that there was a considerable gulf between the two poets so early as 1803, thus ignoring the deep affection for Coleridge expressed in *The Prelude* and in the letters Dorothy and her brother wrote to various persons between 1804 and 1806, especially the joint letter to Coleridge of March 29, 1804. He fails to quote the letter to Beaumont of August 1, [1805]³ when Wordsworth, having finished his autobiography, found difficulty in continuing *The Recluse*: "Should Coleridge return, so that I might have some conversation with him on the subject, I should go on swimmingly." Coleridge was not only Wordsworth's closest and most gifted friend but the only one with whom he had ever talked over his poems and his theory of poetry. If the early Coleridge had not been destroyed by opium and the later Coleridge alienated by a quarrel, Wordsworth's poetic life might well have been prolonged.

Family cares may have had more to do with the matter than Dean Sperry thinks (pp. 216-19), since Wordsworth's children, who appear to have contributed little to his poetry, brought many anxieties, an intolerably crowded house, loss of quiet, and great curtailment of freedom. Then, too, withdrawal from the world while it gave him an admirable opportunity for turning past experiences into poetry cut Wordsworth off from new experiences. The reaction from the French Revolution and French radical philosophy ("Godwinism"), together with his love for Annette, had made him a poet, but when these impulses were exhausted Grasmere could, after the first few years, furnish no new force, no later experience, to take their place.

Dean Sperry has not taken the trouble to make an index or to indicate the source of most of the passages he cites. He has also fallen into a number of mistakes, the most serious of which is that Wordsworth followed Godwin in regarding the imagination as passive, "mechanically conceived and mechanically produced" (p. 138). But throughout *The Prelude* (for example, in II. 232-65, 358-76; VIII. 639-43; XIII. 355-60; XIV. 86-103, 188-218) Words-

³ So Knight; as the letter is not in de Selincourt's *Early Letters* and as Wordsworth learned August 15, 1806 of Coleridge's return, the correct date is presumably August 1, 1806.

worth insists that the imagination is active and creative, a chief source of our insight into higher truth. I recall no reason for thinking that Wordsworth's "speculative interest in children, and in particular in his own childhood, was far more a reasoned dogma than a spontaneous impulse" (p. 134) or that he removed "Vaudracour and Julia" from *The Prelude*, where artistically it was a great blemish, lest its biographical implications should be discovered (p. 57). And I see every reason for not believing that Wordsworth left France to get on with his poetry and so to provide for Annette (pp. 59-60, 152)—his words are, "Compell'd by nothing less than absolute want Of funds for my support" (*Prelude* A, x. 191-2).

The book is honest and frank; its author confesses that he finds Wordsworth's personality unattractive and that he has to "toil through the closing books of *The Prelude*" (p. 169, cf. 56). But for the poet's greatest and most characteristic work he has not only sympathy but depth of understanding.

Professors Campbell and Mueschke trace Wordsworth's aesthetic development from the *Borderers* to "Michael." They believe that "a deserted girl and her child . . . seemed to possess his memory like an obsession" (p. 13), that he employed the tale of terror, the sentimental, moral tale, the conversational narrative, and the ballad because these forms were "suited to giving his forbidden emotions furtive and disguised expression," and that Hartley later systematized and "gave a philosophical basis to all his cherished philosophical practices" (p. 39). Unfortunately very little use is made of *The Prelude* or of the Prospectus prefixed to *The Excursion*; the interpretation of some of the passages quoted is dubious; and the absence of remorse from "Vaudracour and Julia," the one piece which is certainly related to the Annette affair, is not explained. The second part of the essay is devoted to proving "the soundness of the aesthetic and metaphysical affirmations" made in the Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads*. The interesting parallels quoted from Reynold's *Discourses* raise the important question, Did the critics of the early nineteenth century owe anything of importance to their eighteenth-century predecessors?

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

The Pursuit of Death. A Study of Shelley's Poetry. By BENJAMIN P. KURTZ. New York: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. xxii + 339.

Professor Kurtz in adopting a line of study differing from that of his predecessors has explored a most interesting and fruitful subject. The theme of Death is one which few poets have neg-

lected, but he has shown how closely woven is this subject with Shelley's life and work, and how the references to death in his poetry so largely outnumber those in the poetry of any other poet of importance. He has suggested how events in the poet's own life are reflected and revealed in individual poems or passages in relation to his main subject, and he has shown by comparison how other poets treated similar ideas or phases. Professor Kurtz's knowledge of his subject is thorough, and his treatment displays exceptional ability and enthusiasm. Notwithstanding that he describes this critical examination of Shelley's life and poetry, too modestly, as a "little essay" it is in fact a most discursive treatise, and notable achievement.

Death as a theme appears in Shelley's earliest verses, although such allusions, in the main, may be attributed to intuition. Professor Kurtz has treated its development from the poet's boyhood, while under the thrall of that curious cult known as the "School of Terror" in which death was the principal bogey. We are guided, year by year, through the tempestuous period of *Queen Mab*, and so on to the last years of disillusion. It might be supposed that Shelley's constant references to death, before he could know what it actually meant, may be regarded as the meditations of a young poet who viewed the subject as a suitable one for poetical treatment. It was more likely he was at the time haunted by the mystery of death and its consequences. Very early he suffered in other respects, and knew grief which he believed to be more cruel than death itself. He had lost, though not by death, his first love, his father, mother, sisters and his home, and was soon to become an exile in a foreign land. It was not long, however, before he had some bitter personal experiences of death. In three or four years he surveyed mortality in all its most ghastly horror in the suicides of Fanny Godwin, and his forlorn wife Harriet, and in the deaths of his two much-loved children Clara and William. So the basis of Shelley's best poetry, like the poetry of others, was his experience of life. Thus Shelley unlocked his heart. It is noticeable that the dynamic impulse, which dominates much of his earlier verse, cooled down as his life advanced and as he mastered his technique; until at last he seemed to confess himself as a passive spectator in a tumultuous and turbulent world whose activities are sterile and doomed to failure. Although, towards the end of his life he appears to have lost hope for himself, as earlier he had lost faith in a personal survival after death, the fire of his poetry once again burst forth and breathed of hope and faith in a better state for the human race, with magnificent enthusiasm, in *Hellas*.

For many years Germany held the ground *par excellence* for scholarly editorial work: witness the texts of the Greek and Latin Classics edited by Tuton savants. It now seems that America is

steadily becoming famous for her eminent scholars in this field, and Professor Kurtz's work is a notable example.

ROGER INGPEN

London

[Mr. Ingpen, the foremost authority on Shelley of our generation, died on January 18th, before the proof of this review reached him.—Eds.]

The Romantic Agony. By MARIO PRAZ. Translated from the Italian by ANGUS DAVIDSON. London [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. xviii + 456. \$7.50.

The Romantic Agony is a survey of the literature of "erotic sensibility" in the nineteenth century. It touches upon the literatures of all western Europe (and Russia), though it draws its examples mainly from French, English, and Italian letters. The assumption of the volume is that "in no other literary period . . . has sex been so obviously the mainspring of works of imagination," and it is to the working out of the more abnormal aspects of the sexual theme that the study is devoted. There is an elaborate index; and in addition each chapter is followed by a section of references, notes, illustrative examples, and ancillary argument.

The first chapter sets up the distinction between the union of beauty and horror in the romantic movement and the same union in other literary periods such as the seventeenth century, that distinction being the difference between "a mere intellectual pose," as with the *concettisti*, and "a pose of sensibility," which Praz finds the central quality of the romantics in this regard. Upon this assumption the argument of the book in large part depends. The second chapter traces the metamorphosis of the Satan of Tasso and Marino as a literary figure into the "fatal man" of the romantics—the Byronic hero, the male vampire, the criminal erotic. In the third chapter Praz enters into an elaborate argument to show that to this tendency towards delight in criminal and sexual suffering the influence of the novels of the Marquis de Sade gave a special impetus, since, to the type of fatal man, the romantics added the type of persecuted woman, and under the spell of their admiration for *Justine* and its companion works, found a special delight in erotic pain. By the mid-century the fatal man passes into a new incarnation as the fatal woman—Cleopatra, Mary Stuart, the Monna Lisa and all their sisterhood. The fifth chapter leads even more directly into the literature of the decadence—the pleasures of immobile sterility, of algolagnia in exotic surroundings, the evocation of the merciless siren, and the

macabre ordered as formal art. The appendix on Swinburne discusses sexual flagellation and sadism, considered on the continent to be especially characteristic of English abnormality.

It should be emphasized that *The Romantic Agony* is neither a monograph in comparative ethics nor a treatise of sociology, but a cool and objective examination of a certain set of literary phenomena. As such the volume makes an unmistakable contribution to our knowledge of nineteenth century literature—a contribution for which Lafourcade's *La Jeunesse de Swinburne* had, so far as English literature is concerned, prepared the way. The evidence is overpowering that these themes and these types occupy, not a veiled corner of a nineteenth-century library—veiled as one pushes *erotica* out of the way—but an important place on the bookshelves. Current discussion of nineteenth century moralism needs the correction which Praz gives, and in estimating the century we shall hereafter have to give a larger place to immoralism in that wonderful epoch than we have hitherto done. So far as the body of the material is concerned Praz can not be ignored.

At the same time one of the most baffling problems of his volume is the theory on which it is constructed. Praz tells us that the recurrence of morbid themes is not necessarily an indication of a psychopathic state in the writers discussed; he finds "the education of sensibility, and more especially of erotic sensibility" one of the particular and fundamental aspects of romantic literature; and holds further that the education of sensibility came about through works of art, so that "what it is therefore chiefly important to establish is the means by which the transmission of themes from one artist to another is effected." But he goes on to remark:

The mysterious bond between pleasure and suffering has certainly always existed; it is one of the *vulnera naturae* which is as old as man himself. But it became the common inheritance of Romantic and Decadent sensibility through a particular chain of literary influences.

To this reviewer the lines of argument seem here to be inextricably entangled. Praz himself insists upon the difference in kind between the treatment of the beauty of horror in the seventeenth century and that in the nineteenth—the one being an intellectual mode, the other being a mode of sensibility; yet it is surely naive to lump all seventeenth-century writers into one category, and all nineteenth-century writers into another. If we had more biographical data about the seventeenth century, we might easily discern pathological states of mind in those writers we are not now aware of; and we should be compelled to argue that their delight in horror was not merely an intellectual mode but also a mode of sensibility in the fashion of the nineteenth century. Contrariwise, although it must be granted that the treatment of

psychopathic themes does not necessarily argue a psychopathic state in the writer, it would appear that something more is needed to explain the pleasure of nineteenth-century writers in these themes than a common inheritance through a particular chain of literary influence; we should have to distinguish between intellectual and "literary" perversity, and the employment of perverse themes because they satisfy the morbid emotional needs of the writer. A writer may be drawn to an abnormal theme by reason of a genuine love for abnormality, or he may be drawn to it because he loves a literary *tour de force*. There are all kinds of differences in the treatment of the erotic. Thus the cerebral excitement of Swinburne is different from the emotional decadence of portions of *Les Fleurs de Mal*—among the poems of which we should again have to distinguish between those having a philosophical origin and those existing for the sake of sensibility. Praz allows for this distinction in his "Introduction," but he seems to forget it in the body of the book. Thus he quotes, "Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought," to show that it was Shelley's "disconsolate conclusion that pain is inseparable from human pleasure," quite overlooking the fact that Shelley was stating a philosophical paradox; and on the next page he quotes Baudelaire's "Hymne à la Beauté" as saying "the same thing," but the "same thing" is said with a quite different implication. D'Annunzio, Praz tells us, plagiarized Swinburne, but is the resulting "sensibility" identical? One sees the confusion quite clearly when Praz seriously says of "The Sphinx" that Wilde "inflates his cat to the proportions of Cleopatra," forgetting the fact that the cold, hard, metallic glitter of the poem is in a totally different frame of reference from even the same author's *Salomé*. The difference which separates the Marquis de Sade from Dreiser is the difference I have in mind; in *Justine* the "lesson" is, Evil, be thou my God! but in *The Hand of the Potter* the most utterly vile of pervers is pictured with human sympathy (I waive the question of literary merit in both cases), because the author believes that sympathetic insight should be extended to those who are beyond even very liberal humanitarianism.

To be quite fair to Praz it would be necessary to examine the concepts of romanticism and of literary history which he sets up, but for this there is not space. *The Romantic Agony* is at once a revealing and an enigmatic study, but one which nineteenth century scholarship will ignore at its peril.

HOWARD MUMFORD JONES

University of Michigan

Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century. By LOIS WHITNEY. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. xxii + 343. \$2.75.

It is doubly fitting that this volume should have appeared under the auspices of The Johns Hopkins Press, since it is clearly associated, both in its subject matter and in its method, with movements in scholarship in which Johns Hopkins has been a dominant force. As a study in primitivism, it forms an important chapter in the series of studies which are now going forward under the direction of Professor Arthur O. Lovejoy, and which, in time, will afford the definitive treatment of this confusing complex of ideas. The method of the "history of ideas," which is here employed by the author, is likewise one in which various Johns Hopkins scholars have been pioneers.

The general subject of primitivism is one which Miss Whitney handled capably and with important conclusions in her earlier work on primitivistic theories of epic origins. In the earlier studies she was concerned with a more limited problem; here she has approached what is perhaps the most complex of all problems of primitivism in the age in which these problems became most confusing. She has sought to trace in the popular literature of the eighteenth century the development not only of such confusing moral and aesthetic ideas as are involved in terms like "simplicity," "degeneration," "taste," "sentiment," "sensibility," "nature," but also the way in which, during this period, the rapid development of "ideas of progress" tended for a time to put an end to theories of primitivism which had had such perennial vitality. Of all the sections of the volume, none are more illuminating than those which show that humanity is, like the White Queen, capable of believing six impossible things at once. Popular novelists and poets on one page cried out wistfully for the simple world of the past, on the next hailed exultantly the future.

Such a study as this gains much from the fact that the author is primarily concerned with popular literature. While she constantly shows her awareness of the so-called "philosophical" literature in the period—indeed, her first chapter is a highly competent analysis of such literature—she does not make the mistake, so common among historians of philosophy, of believing that philosophical ideas exist in a vacuum, and are handed down merely from philosopher to philosopher. She shows clearly that first-rate thinkers often draw from third-rate literature; and that the dissemination of ideas to the larger public is more often the result of third-rate popular writing than of technically "philosophical" works.

The deft handling of the confusing antithesis between primi-

tivism and progress is largely the result of Miss Whitney's own acute and careful study of her terms; it is, in part, however, the result of her training in the method of the "history of ideas." Thanks to the lucidity which results from that combination, the reader is able to make his way with ease through a vast mass of material which in less skilful hands would have become overwhelming; is able to study the background and development of these diverse ideas; and finally to see them fall into relation in that sort of whole, where—the author would undoubtedly agree—"all must full or not coherent be!" It is no easy task which she set herself. The mere accumulation of concrete details indicates a wealth of reading and a familiarity with unusual and forgotten sources. Her handling of this material shows expertness and unusual ability.

Naturally, it will seem to any critic who is more interested in one of these main conceptions than in the other, that equal justice has not been done to both primitivism and progress. Possibly because of Miss Whitney's longer study of primitivism, or possibly because of my more intimate acquaintance with the literature of progress, it seems to me that the sections on the latter idea are not so good as those dealing with the former. Miss Whitney has analyzed with care the idea of a "chain of being" as contributing to the idea of progress, and has had a good deal to say of the seventeenth-century scientific conceptions which lay back of the idea of evolution. But it seems strange to find in the general treatment of the background of the idea of progress no mention of the Baconian influence, which surely was of profound psychological importance in stimulating thinking on the subject; no suggestion of the scientific "Battle of the Books," which in its sharp clash of opinion had much to do with the rapid breaking down of dependence upon the past and certainly much to do with the temporary eclipse of primitivism; nothing of the invention of scientific instruments in which the "moderns" found their irrefutable claim for superiority over the "ancients," and pride in which led to disparagement of the Greeks, of the "noble savage," even of "our Father Adam!" Likewise, although Miss Whitney pays some attention to the general concepts of physics and astronomy which lay back of the idea of progress, she hardly touches the much more influential concepts of biology, particularly microbiology, though these concepts were more immediately appealing to the popular readers and writers whom she treats, and are frequently reflected in the ones she quotes.

Yet these are, after all, for the most part, matters of background rather than foreground, and she herself has pointed out that her treatment of the seventeenth-century background is necessarily generalized and brief. It is chiefly because her analysis of the philosophical backgrounds of the seventeenth century is so satisfactory that one wishes for an equally penetrating treat-

ment of the scientific background. She might also, for example, had she gone further into the scientific literature of the period, have found some excellent illustrations for her chapter on "The Popularization of the Idea of Progress" in the many volumes of popular science which poured forth in the eighteenth century, and which were as eagerly read as were the novels and periodicals of the day.

These omissions, however, are perhaps only defects of the qualities of this volume. Had Miss Whitney attempted to include all this material, she would have found herself with another volume, and even her admitted deftness in handling masses of material might well have broken down. The volume as it stands remains an excellent study and a contribution worthy of the series of which it forms a part.

MARJORIE NICOLSON

Smith College

Catálogo bibliográfico y crítico de las comedias anunciadas en los periódicos de Madrid desde 1661 hasta 1819. By ADA M. COE. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. xii + 270. \$3.50.

This bibliographical study is of tremendous value and importance to every student interested in Spanish drama from the *Siglo de Oro* through the Romantic period. It is in general an alphabetical list of plays announced in the newspapers of Madrid from 1661 to 1819, containing an index of authors cited, a list of periodicals consulted, and a bibliography. The study begins with *La Gaceta* (1661), which published its first announcement in 1667, and continues to 1819. The last date is chosen as a concluding point on account of a study now in preparation by Professor N. B. Adams and Dr. A. K. Shields.¹ In the alphabetical list of plays Miss Coe includes bibliographical and critical material from 1671 to 1792 and for the year 1819. For the period 1793-1818, covered in Cotarelo y Mori, *Isidoro Máiquez y el teatro de su tiempo*, only the date of the *estreno* is given. This means that, for a complete number of performances, one must supplement from Cotarelo's list, which is often unreliable. The complete number of performances is not always recorded, and, naturally, the date of the *estreno* is often inaccurate.

¹ This study will be a list of plays and a history of the Madrid stage of the Romantic period. Mr. Shields' unpublished doctoral dissertation of the University of Carolina, "The Madrid Stage, 1819-1834" (1932) contains a critical study and catalogue. He and Mr. Adams already have collected material to extend the study to 1850. It is hoped that this work will soon be published.

It is to be regretted that Miss Coe's list does not include operas sung in the Madrid theatres. This is especially objectionable—possibly only to this reviewer, now delving into the connections between Italian opera and Spanish drama—since Italian opera in Madrid was not regarded as an exotic flower as it was in some other countries; operatic performances were understood and enjoyed and the Spaniard had a real passion for them. In fact, practically all public operatic performances up to 1826 were sung in Spanish. Then, there is little doubt that opera contributed in many ways to the Romantic drama, especially in plots, scenery, costumes and stagecraft. Carmena y Millán, *Crónica de la ópera italiana en Madrid* (Madrid, 1878), Cotarelo y Mori, *Orígenes y establecimiento de la ópera en España hasta 1800* (Madrid, 1917), and Virella y Cassañes, *La ópera en Barcelona* (Barcelona, 1888)—not mentioned in Miss Coe's bibliography—would have been of inestimable aid in checking the date of *estreno*, the composer, and the librettist of the various pieces.

It seems that a few more of the authors might have been readily identified. Often some of the sources cited, especially Moratín, are unreliable, and a number of inaccuracies are to be found in the index. Omissions and errors will occur in any bibliography of this scope and nature; they are inevitable. The work will remain, however, of great helpfulness and aid to all students of Spanish Drama.

STERLING A. STOUDEMIRE

University of North Carolina

The Early Days of Joel Barlow, A Connecticut Wit—Yale Graduate, Editor, Lawyer, and Poet, Chaplain During the Revolutionary War—His Life and Works from 1754 to 1787. By THEODORE ALBERT ZUNDER. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 320. \$2.00. (Yale Studies in English, LXXXIV.)

The City in the American Novel, 1789-1900. A Study of American Novels Portraying Contemporary Conditions in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston. By GEORGE ARTHUR DUNLAP. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1934. Pp. 187. \$1.00.

Constance Fenimore Woolson, Literary Pioneer. By JOHN DWIGHT KERN. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1934. Pp. 198. \$1.00.

Poésie Moderne aux États-Unis (Conférences publiques de l'Université de Grenoble, publiées dans la Revue des Cours et Conférences). Par JEAN CATEL. Paris: Ancienne Librairie Furne, Boivin & Cie., Editeurs. Pp. 56.

Neuengland in der Erzählenden Literatur Amerikas. Von HELENE WIDENMANN. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1935. Pp. xiv + 128. M. 5.00. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, LXXXVI.)

Joel Barlow is a familiar and interesting figure to students of American literature, but C. B. Todd's biography and the other shorter studies, biographical and critical, are none of them exhaustive. Mr. Zunder's book now supplies a full account of Barlow's early years, based on a thorough combing of the sources, printed and unprinted. There can be nothing but praise for the diligence in investigation which it reveals. It is painstakingly detailed; it is well documented, although the absence of a complete bibliography of books cited often makes it hard to run down the full titles of certain volumes referred to; and it contains a most useful list of books and articles on Barlow. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Zunder has presented his material clumsily. His zeal for thoroughness has led him sometimes to clog his pages with trivial, or actually irrelevant, fact, and he has shown little skill in selecting and arranging his data. Moreover, he writes badly. There are many paragraphs crowded with needless repetitions of words and names, and there are trite phrases and awkward constructions. There are bits such as these: Miss Whitman "hoped that he would study his faults, like Mirabel studied Millimant's"; Buckminster "approved of Barlow writing an American poem"; "Barlow had a long conversation at Hartford with Noah Webster and with Elizabeth Whitman if she was in town." The comment on Barlow's writings adds little to what the hastiest reader of them must inevitably understand for himself. Its defects, then, make this book unsuccessful either as biography or as criticism. It is useful simply as a collection of information, the raw material for a valuable study. Barlow deserves better treatment, for, though he was never a great writer, he played an active part in the intellectual and literary history of his time in this country.

Mr. Dunlap sets out "to trace chronologically the facts about the various phases of life in the city which the contemporary novels record" and "to determine whether the same novels have qualities that make them of permanent value." The result is essentially a catalogue of novels, briefly described and commented on. As a catalogue it is useful; as anything more it is disappointing. The criticism is for the most part elementary, and many of the better books discussed have been more adequately treated elsewhere. A

thoughtful book on the novelists' attitudes toward the American city as a phenomenon in our civilization, and on possible changes in the novel brought about by the urbanization of this country, would be interesting and important, but Mr. Dunlap misses the larger issues in his care for details. Nor are the "facts" about city life which he finds in fiction, always safely to be called facts. He lists historical authorities (Winsor's name is misprinted as "Winson") but without fuller comparison than he offers between what the novelists described and what the actual records show, it is impossible to be confident that the storytellers' pictures were accurate or even meant to be so. Sometimes, surely, the authors simply made use of fictional commonplaces, already conventionalized by frequent use. These, however true basically and in general, represent neither the writer's own direct observation nor anything to be relied on for a student who would deal with "facts about . . . life in the city."

Mr. Kern's *Constance Fenimore Woolson*, also a printed doctoral dissertation, puts in convenient compass the story of Miss Woolson's life, and includes summaries of the content of her most important work, together with some critical discussion of her qualities as critic, writer of the short story, and novelist. A chronological list of her writings fills twelve pages, and is followed by a bibliography of books which shed light on her work and on her life. Mr. Kern has done his task in workmanlike fashion. His material—some of it new—is worth having, and he presents it adequately. Here and there there are bits of real critical value and, even though the book as a whole is not distinguished in style or in its study of Miss Woolson's merits and defects, it is one to be grateful for, since it may do something to revive interest in an author who does not deserve to be as completely forgotten as she has been. Her work in carrying "local color" beyond Harte toward realism, and her efforts along the lines followed by Henry James, make her, in spite of her obvious limitations, an American writer entitled to a modest but secure place in our literary annals.

Professor Catel's little book deals chiefly with the imagists of twenty years ago, and with Emily Dickinson and Walt Whitman. Much of his comment on these poets is appreciative and discerning. Unfortunately he is not content with this, but attempts to give a broader meaning to his work. He begins: "Je me propose d'expliquer comment la poésie est née sur la terre américaine," and proceeds to generalize freely throughout as to the nature and development of poetry in this country. His evidence supports his conclusions, to be sure, but it is drawn from few writers and is but a small part of what should be taken into account in any serious study of subjects so large. On almost every page the reader well versed in our literary, intellectual, and social history will find himself uncomfortably aware that half-truths are being given

exaggerated emphasis and that certain wholly relevant data, which might vitiate much of the theorizing, are being passed over in silence. We read that American poets "sont obligés de se forger un langage personnel, car l'anglais d'Europe . . . n'a plus pour leurs oreilles la résonance voulue. Les lois qui ont réglé les rythmes anglais ne sont pas plus admises par eux, que les décrets du Parlement britannique," and, on another page: "Nous avons vu que Walt Whitman et Emily Dickinson rejetant la tradition du vers figé retrouvaient spontanément le vers-formule magique des débuts de l'humanité." There is some truth, surely, in each of these remarks, but neither is completely true. Professor Catel offers them without qualification. Nor does he attempt to explain away the awkward questions they raise at once in the mind of anyone concerned with the whole range of American poetry since 1840, or with the relation between our verse-makers and the primitive origins of poetic art.

Miss Widenmann's book is a study of New England Puritanism and the New England attitude as revealed in the work of Catherine Maria Sedgwick, Hawthorne, Mrs. Stowe, Sarah Orne Jewett, and certain others. Its author has much to say that is worth reading, much that has genuine critical merit; but the value of the book lies in its revelation of the point of view of a foreign student without firsthand knowledge of the people it treats, rather than in any thorough insight into the theme. Almost wholly it relies on secondary authorities, and, inevitably, only on those which were accessible in Germany. Thus, for example, F. O. Matthiessen's study of Miss Jewett is not used, and the whole account of Puritanism is vitiated because it is based not on what the Puritans wrote but on what historians, of varying prejudices and varying equipments, have chosen to say about them and their ideas. Accordingly many pages must be read with profound scepticism by anyone who has gone beyond the secondary authorities, and here and there are downright errors—as in the extraordinary paragraph which not only perpetuates the old superstition about Cotton Mather's responsibility for the witchcraft executions but sets these executions at least a year after the last took place. The parallel between the Quakers and the Puritans in respect to their attitude toward literature is surely false; the assumption that because "Yankee" is a name for a New Englander all that has been said of "Yankees" applies directly to New Englanders, is dangerous; the emphasis on Hawthorne as a didactic moralist will not please those who think of him as a man concerned with sin and moral problems but rarely with a desire to preach or to support a code; the insistence that the Puritans relied wholly on the Old Testament, in preference to the New, will not satisfy anyone well read in their theological writings; and on many other points the book will provoke readers to question rather than to

accept. But, with all its faults, it is a study worth pondering, for even its errors are at times stimulating and on many pages its very superficiality and its complete detachment from local prejudices give it freshness and boldness in generalization sometimes far to seek in essays of greater thoroughness and accuracy.

KENNETH B. MURDOCK

Harvard University

The Restoration Theatre. By MONTAGUE SUMMERS. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. Pp. xxi + 352. \$3.75.

The seven chapters of this handsome volume—the first of a projected four-volume work on the Restoration Theatre—constitute a vast and somewhat trying miscellany which is, nevertheless, a substantial contribution to its field. Mr. Summers' main objective, he states, is to elucidate the "physical conditions," i. e., "the practical machinery" of the Restoration stage: its curtain and scenery, lighting, costume, stage-business, tricks, and devices. Coincident with these problems of stage technique, however, he treats also a great variety of matters less concerned with the stage than with the theatre at large—orange wenches, vizard masques, and the behavior of audiences, and theatrical advertising and systems of admission; and still others—witness the chapters on *The Prologue* and *The Epilogue*—which are as much a part of Restoration drama as of its stage. In a sense, stage, theatre, and drama are, of course, one and inseparable. Even sturdy specialists, however, may find Mr. Summers' presentation somewhat troublesome, chiefly because he fails to organize his findings on any one level either within his chapters or in their sequence, and because the subject-matter entries of the Index are too scanty to guide one through the labyrinth. This is the more regrettable because of the very sweep and largeness of the work, for in his indefatigable accumulation of evidence from stage-directions, prompt notes, prologues, epilogues, prefaces, and other pertinent documents, Mr. Summers has brought together a body of illustrative materials more comprehensive and abundant than any hitherto available within two covers. The sheer weight of these materials might, indeed, have been effectively distributed—and the book made more readable thereby—if Mr. Summers could have brought himself to print the superfluous in clearly captioned supplementary notes or appendices. But the material is there, and for this all concerned will be grateful even though some readers may regret the temper of the book here and there or question occasionally the interpretation of the evidence.

It is fair to add that the exceptions just taken are less applicable

to the second half of the volume than to the first. The discussion of Costume, and of Realism on the Stage, for example, is comparatively clear in presentation, and vigorously colorful in the writing. Some of the earlier chapters are less fresh, and possibly more "derivative" than Mr. Summers may have realized. At all events, in view of his strictures against other scholars (p. xiv and elsewhere), one regrets the lack of more adequate acknowledgment to certain of his predecessors—notably to the pioneer work (by no means invalidated by the present volume) of W. J. Lawrence; and the tendency to damn with consistently faint praise or silence such others as Odell, Bernbaum, and Nicoll. Again, one may question whether his broadsides against the critics¹ who do not share his whole-souled enthusiasm for the Restoration Theatre will really help to cure them. The copious and illuminating information he has brought to bear on the subject of Restoration theatrical conditions should prove better medicine. Valuable doses for critics, and others, may be drawn, for example, from the reprint (Appendix I) of Robert Gould's vigorous satire, *The Play-House* (1685); from Mr. Summers' vivid sketch (Appendix III) of the Phoenix Society's recent activities in the revival of Restoration and Elizabethan plays; and from the majority of the twenty-odd full-page plates which illustrate the volume.

Questions as to one detail or another of Mr. Summers' interpretation of his materials will certainly suggest themselves to his readers. I can mention but one or two. His discussion of the free list, for example, repeatedly (pp. 44, 46) conveys the impression that this institution was of Restoration or eighteenth-century origin—which is certainly wrong, since all varieties of free-listers are known to have flourished mightily in Elizabethan times. Again, I think he offers no adequate evidence for the conjecture that "in the earlier years of the Restoration theatre the stage was . . . permanently² covered with . . . 'the green-baize carpet of tragedy'" (pp. 269-70); nor for the suggestion (pp. 167-68) that Congreve, above all the other comic dramatists, especially "misliked the artificiality" of the traditional "terminal dance." More serious objection, finally, may be taken to another suggestion, if I read it aright, concerning Elizabethan staging. When, according to Mr. Summers (p. 196), "Shakespeare's Lorenzo . . . whispered . . . to his . . . Jessica 'The moon shines bright . . . ' the lovers in the Belmont garden were bathed in silver radiance" proceeding from some scenic device "little different from . . . painted flats." I know of no satisfactory evidence to support this shadow-shape of painted flats on the stage of the Elizabethan public theatres.³ The man

¹ E. g., St. John Ervine, who "scribble[s]" like "an abnormally stupid schoolboy"; William Archer, "obviously unintelligent and obtuse"; Granville-Barker, "utterly and lamentably ignorant of the technique of the Restoration theatre" (pp. 282, 326, 149-50).

² My italics.

³ Cf. Thorndike, *Shakespeare's Theater*, pp. 112, 114.

who "disfigures" Moonshine in *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* merely personified Shakespeare's jest at the crude *properties* of the amateurs; and in all probability Lorenzo and Jessica reclined upon a *property bank* (cf. *Merchant*, v, i, 54-55) on the outer stage. "Painted flats" are virtually unthinkable there, and they are all but unheard of in Elizabethan records.⁴ It may be granted, indeed, though stage-directions are missing, that "elaborate effects of lighting" came into use in the later Jacobean *private* theatres. But, since there is little reason to believe that such effects, and flats to boot, could have been employed on the outer stage of the Theatre or the Curtain, for which *The Merchant* appears to have been written about 1596, it remains altogether likely that the lovers were bathed only in the silver radiance of Shakespeare's poetry.

These, however, are details, and Mr. Summers does not claim to have cleared up every crux. His work is important because its materials throw abundant light upon many places hitherto comparatively dark.

ALWIN THALER.

University of Tennessee

English Poetry and the English Language. By F. W. BATESON.
Oxford [and New York]: Oxford University Press, 1934.
Pp. viii + 129. \$2.25.

Modern histories of Literature are usually based on a sub-structure of social history. Mr. Bateson suggests in his introduction that the semantic history of the English language would make a better framework. Even those who do not agree with him will welcome this careful honest and original little essay in a new style of literary criticism. Those who agree with him (as the reviewer does) will regard its appearance as an event of great potential importance.

Mr. Bateson himself calls the book an 'experiment.' Regarded in that light, it may be said to show that the author is—so far—at his best when collating the history of English Literature, not so much with the semantic as with the purely philological history of the English language. There are for instance few more convincing observations in his book than the subtle distinction he draws between the diffuseness or 'copie' of the typical Elizabethan style and the diffuseness of the typical Victorian style, basing it on the different states of our language at these two periods with respect, not to meaning but to vocabulary.

⁴ Henslowe's exceptional "clothe of the Sone & Mone" (1598; *Henslowe Papers*, p. 117) may have been merely a hanging, more or less like that of "Lazarus in the painted cloth."

The *semantic* history of language, and of the English language in particular is however something different from this. It is the history of the *meanings* of words and their changes of meaning. It resolves itself into a history of consciousness and one's interpretation of it will depend accordingly on one's conception of the nature of consciousness. The author's own conception is revealed by a tell-tale footnote on page 90, where he speaks of Dryden and his readers being "men of the world together" and adds: "... the footing on which Dryden and his readers meet is a social one. The romantic poet was not colloquial because he was anti-social, an individualist, an anarchist; it was not to the vulgar surface of his readers' minds that he addressed himself, but to the recesses of their inner consciousness." This assumption—that human beings are 'anti-social' in the recesses of their consciousness and social only on 'the vulgar surface'—has its reflection in Mr. Bateson's whole conception of the nature of meaning. For him the meanings of words are divisible into two parts (i) their *denotation* (the "thing" which they mean and about which everyone would agree) and (ii) their *connotation* (the moods and emotions which they evoke and which are different in every individual). That this 'naive' classification is always misleading and, for the purpose of judging poetry, quite unreal and useless has been shown really conclusively by Dr. I. A. Richards and others before him. So too you cannot distinguish the 'matter' of a poem arbitrarily from its manner. The subject of a poem is the whole universe of its meaning. The contrary assumption has in the reviewer's opinion led Mr. Bateson hopelessly astray in some of his judgments (notably his estimate of the value and significance of Mr. Walter de la Mare's poetry) and seriously detracts from the value of this his first experiment.

It is greatly to be hoped that Mr. Bateson will repeat it on a larger scale after first giving further consideration to the whole problem of meaning.

OWEN BARFIELD

London

Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1935. Goethe-Kalender auf das Jahr 1936. Herausgegeben vom Frankfurter Goethe-Museum. Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlags-buchhandlung.

Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts Frankfurt am Main MCMXXXII/III. Im Auftrag der Verwaltung herausgegeben von ERNST BEUTLER. Halle a. d. Saale: Kommissionsverlag Max Niemeyer.

Freies Deutsches Hochstift, Ansprachen, ditto.

Der Goethe-Kalender, seit Jahren vom Leiter des Frankfurter Goethe-Museums, Dr. Ernst Beutler, herausgegeben, ist wohl die

einzigste Publikation dieser Art, welche die alte Tradition fortführt, mit dem Kalender eine ernsthafte literarische Unterhaltung zu verbinden, die zugleich wissenschaftlich zuverlässig und künstlerisch geschmackvoll den Leser unterrichtet und in ein Gefühl des ästhetischen Behagens versetzt. Der Herausgeber geht mit gutem Beispiel voran; wir verdanken ihm (1935) den reizenden Aufsatz mit dem schelmischen Titel "Von der Ilm zum Susquehanna," der ein Beweis dafür ist, wie die gründlichste Kenntnis eines bereits vielbesprochenen Themas durch Augenschau erst lebendig wird, indem des Verfassers Amerikareise die vielfachen Beziehungen zwischen Goethe und Amerika bildhaft und fruchtbar werden läßt und durch Auswertung des Reisejournals Bernhards von Weimar neue Seiten abgewinnt. Nicht minder erfolgreich und lebendig ist aber auch in der Ausgabe dieses Jahres seine Ueberprüfung der Quellen unsres Wissens vom historischen Faust und der Entstehung der Faustsage. Aus den übrigen Beiträgen ragen hervor der prächtige Essay Max Kommerels über Goethes Gedicht, der in hoher Ueberschau die Grundzüge von Goethes lyrischem Schaffen von der Straßburger Zeit bis zu seinem Tode entwickelt und auf vierzig schmalen Seiten wirklich Tiefes und Neues zu sagen weiß, und Hermann Hesses ebenso gedrängte Wertung von Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahren.

Es ist ja über den Meister viel geschrieben worden und Gutes und Kluges ist über seine Entstehung, Bedeutung und Kunst zu Tage gefördert. Das alles weiß Hesse. Ihm indessen, dem Dichter, gelingt es, dies alles zusammenzuschauen, wie über eine Landschaft von Einzelscenes den großen, reinen Himmelsdom zu wölben, das Werk als hohes Geschenk des größten Menschen einer außergewöhnlichen Zeit fühlbar zu machen, das uns auch heute noch, und gerade heute immer Neues zu sagen hat. Der Aufsatz ist schon durch die Dankbarkeit, Ehrfurcht und Gerechtigkeit, Züge, die er im *Meister* selbst findet, und die klare, warme, vollendete Darstellung ein seltener Genuß.

Der Doppelband des *Jahrbuches* bringt eine reiche Ausbeute. Klug, aber in etwas verstimmend geistreicher Gewaltigkeit handelt Max Kommerel vom Leben des Volksliedes in der Kunstlyrik. Paul Böckmann wird der vielgeschmähten Aufklärung mit seltener Besonnenheit gerecht, indem er den Witz als ihr Formprinzip erkennt und dadurch ihr Verhältnis zum Rokoko klärt, das nicht, wie Ermatinger will, mit ihr identisch ist, sondern eine Sonderform des Rokoko sei, und nicht, wie Kindermann will, eine Verfallserscheinung, sondern aus der lebenskräftigsten Wurzel der Frühzeit dieser Periode entspringe und von Lessing mit tieferem Gehalt unterbaut und in eine neue Form überführt werde. "Die realistische Wendung des späten Schiller," eine neue Diesseitsbewertung, "einen Rücklauf in sich selbst," behandelt Hermann Gumbel, während Julia Gauß die methodologische Grundlage von Goethes

Geschichtsforschung in einem tiefgreifenden Aufsatz untersucht, der mit dem Goetheworte schließt: "Es gibt kein Vergangenes, das man zurücksehnen dürfte, es gibt nur ein ewig Neues, das sich aus den erweiterten Elementen des Vergangenen gestaltet." Joachim Müller sieht in Stifters Kunst- und Naturauffassung "die Heiligung der Existenz," und Otto Kletzel untersucht Goethes Landschaftszeichnung an der Hand seiner Vorbilder und mit Wiedergabe von fünfzehn vorzüglichen Tafeln.

Die Ansprachen zur Feier des Gedächtnisses von Schillers hundertfünfundsiebzigstem Geburtstage (von Beutler) und des fünfundziebigsten Bestehens des Hochstiftes (von Bernus) erfreuen durch das hohe künstlerische und ethische Niveau, das in allen diesen Veröffentlichungen der Frankfurter Stiftungen den Geist des Humanitätszeitalters lebendig erhält.

ERNST FEISE

Étude sémantique de l'anglicisme dans le parler franco-américain de Salem (Nouvelle Angleterre). Par EDWARD POUSLAND. Paris: Société de Publications Romanes et Françaises (sous la direction de Mario Roques), 1934. Pp. 311. Fr. 60.

Dr. Pousland's volume is a Paris dissertation for which he received a university doctorate with *mention honorable*, the jury consisting of MM. Vendryes, Jeanroy, and Fouché. The book is a compilation and study of over five hundred anglicisms culled from about fifty issues of the weekly six-page *Courrier de Salem*¹ (1931-32). Dr. Pousland has given elaborate and conscientious treatment to the many details of an attractive subject; in particular, his conclusions are set forth with signal honesty and balance. The author's investigations are opportune and timely in a field too much neglected by American scholars.

The book still contains much of the thesis scaffolding which should not have survived in print; non-essentials frequently accompany the citations, and the bibliography could be limited to North American French alone. The *Glossaire du parler français au Canada*, while often invoked, should have been explicitly checked for every citation in the book. Moisy's Anglo-Norman dictionary is far too heavily relied upon for Old French. The chapter division suffers somewhat from the misplacement of numerous citations, mainly in the category of stylistics; note especially the duplications for *espace* (pp. 80, 257), *offrir* (111, 232), *radio* (132, 217), *résulter* (141, 221). The index is incomplete and at times irrelevant (e. g., *ancien président* 183, *même programme* 209, *grand*

¹ Concerning this choice of subject, cf. A. Dauzat, *Français Moderne*, II, 277-78. A further review by Marcel Fabry occupies a column in *l'Action Wallonne* (Liège; Jan. 15, 1934).

nombre 217); also, printer's errors are much too numerous. Some of the anglicisms are inadequately explained: e. g., *perspective* 124, *événement* 147, *subséquent* 157, *spécialement* 200; explaining *fondation* (= foundation, corset) as 'basis' (p. 86), the author invents the following illustration, "Tel Monsieur ayant appris à parler correctement aura la *fondation appropriée* pour avoir du succès auprès des clients."

While Dr. Pousland observes that the *Courrier* represents the *beau langage* of bilingual Salem (cf. pp. 15, 33-34, 41, 123), it would be helpful to know more about the writers of its columns: are any members of its staff natives of Salem? where did they receive their French language education? which of the articles utilized by the author are derived from English, and which originate in French? do the *Courrier* anglicisms constitute a selective or a comprehensive list? precisely what light do they shed on the actual *parler franco-américain de Salem*? In Brunswick, Maine, for instance, many of these anglicisms (often mere journalistic vagaries) would, if recognized at all, rarely be used in conversation by any of the best educated French-speaking people. An occasional expression from among Dr. Pousland's personal recollections (pp. 270-76) is, to be sure, current among the poorly educated in Brunswick. In criticizing North-American French (e. g., pp. 15, 278), the author tends to forget that its linguistic *standard* is identical with that of Paris. The fact that the anglicisms claimed by Dr. Pousland average scarcely ten per issue would indicate (duplications notwithstanding) the creditable linguistic level of the *Courrier*,² particularly in view of its Anglo-Saxon surroundings.

Many of the foregoing reservations fit into problems which the author proposes to examine in the future. His familiarity with Salem patois, supplemented by bilingual command of French and English, justifies M. Dauzat (*loc. cit.*, 280) in welcoming "M. Pousland comme un sémantiste d'avenir."

EDWARD B. HAM

Yale University

² A cursory study of current numbers suffices to confirm this impression, especially since the majority of anglicisms occur in advertisements and in translations of syndicated cinema "blurbs." I have found, just as, for example, in the 56-year-old daily *Messenger de Lewiston* (Maine), that the editorial page and the leading articles generally set a very high linguistic standard, while athletic accounts, personals, and *faits divers* are conspicuously subject to English influences. A detailed discussion of these considerations would have materially aided evaluation of the data assembled by Dr. Pousland. Incidentally, the printing of the *Courrier* was transferred in 1932 to the offices of the *Étoile de Lowell*, from which it has borrowed many items verbatim (cf. M. Tétrault, *Presse fr.-am. de la Nouvelle Angleterre* [Marseille, 1935], p. 9).

BRIEF MENTION

A History of The German 'Novelle' from Goethe to Thomas Mann. By E. K. BENNET (University of Cambridge). Cambridge: University Press, 1934. xiii + 296 pp. Mr. Bennet has had the courage to close his shutters and let the fireworks of methodology rage outside, which threatens to reduce the familiar world of currents to a multicolored apparition. Thus he is able to center his interest on the development of the German *Novelle* from the end of the 18th century to our days in a book of 300 pages. Moreover, he does not frown upon using the results of other scholars. His first chapter, a concise survey of the subsequent definitions of the genre, draws upon Hirt, Lucacs, Hirsch and others (R. M. Mitchels study on the question of the theory (1915) seems to have escaped his attention); Chapters II-IV lean heavily on Pongs' article in the *Jahrbuch des Freien* (nicht *Frankfurter*!) *Deutschen Hochstifts* and Grolman's essay in *Zeitschrift* (not *Zeitung*!) *für Deutschkunde*. Chapter VI, the Interlude of the *Dorfgeschichte*, is a résumé of Altvater's treatment of the subject in *Germanische Studien*, while the last three chapters proceed to a more independent analysis. The result is a most useful book, which is by no means devoid of the author's own judgment on the basis of first hand information and study. It compares very favorably with the few extant treatments of the subject, which are often mere catalogues of titles, neglects neither the philosophical aspect of currents of literature nor the evaluation of the achievement of individual authors. Storm and Keller receive the largest share of Mr. Bennet's attention, Raabe is unduly curtailed, Meyer viewed too much through Baumgarten's glasses, and the writers after 1880 are treated somewhat summarily. The name of the Contessas does not occur at all in spite of an extended discussion of the romantic *Novelle*. Although composition as the most important factor of form has been dealt with to quite an extent, it is to be regretted that other technical factors, such as *Leitmotiv* and *Erlebte Rede* find no consideration, especially since the book may be successfully used as an introduction to the field for students and thus represents a welcome addition to our handbooks. The Appendix contains some graphs, notes, a selected bibliography, and a complete index. A chronological table would be of value. The misreadings "Karster Kurator" (pp. 172-3), "Kati Friedemann" (p. 279), and the omission of the article in "of all wise God" (p. 173) are noted for correction.

E. F.

Das antiphilosophische Weltbild des französischen Sturm und Drang, 1760-1789. Von KURT WAIS. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt Verlag, 1934. Pp. xii + 262. The term "Aufklärung," popular in Germany, though little used by French critics, Dr. Wais considers an over-simplification of eighteenth-century French thought (p. 5). Adopting from German literary criticism the well-known expression, "Sturm und Drang," the author applies it to the complex of opposing tendencies during the latter half of this period (pp. 2-3). Certainly Dr. Wais, with a wealth of citation, has no difficulty in proving that the philosophic party was not quixotically fighting windmills, but very real opposition. Obviously this is hardly a new discovery, in spite of the author's regrettable tendency to speak at times depreciatingly of the work of M. Mornet and other predecessors (pp. 4, 223). New only, as it seems to me, is the somewhat exaggerated emphasis upon deservedly forgotten figures of the pre-Revolutionary period. These men, Chassignon, Clément, Saint-Martin, and others, help us to understand the conservative reaction during the Restoration, they make clearer the rise of Romantic mysticism, but they are not themselves authors of sufficient vividness and power to merit a place on our bookshelves today. They have earned their oblivion. On the other hand, Dr. W. in my judgment, has over-simplified his conception of Rousseau, and to some degree of Voltaire, in the process of building up against them their "antiphilosophic" enemies. The author relies too much upon occasional passages without taking into account others of equal or greater importance. There are useful materials in this monograph, but the author's interpretations should be accepted with great caution. A well-rounded study of the period might with profit take account of his work, avoiding, however, the one-sidedness into which Dr. W. has been led by excess of zeal for his thesis.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

Ohio State University

Sidelights on Robert Browning's 'The Ring and the Book.' By LOUISE SNITSLAAR. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger, 1934. Pp. 153. Through an analysis of Books II-IV and VIII-IX of *The Ring and the Book*, Miss Snitzlaar aims to show the legitimate place of the arguments of the three representatives of Roman popular opinion and the value of the pleas of the lawyers in the *ensemble* of Browning's poem. She points out the idealization of the poet's documentary sources, stresses Browning's fondness for burlesque, but does not sufficiently emphasize his passion for casuistry as a motive in the composition of these gnarly sections of *The Ring and the Book*. This work is a doctor's thesis of an undigested type and its sound conclusions are somewhat obscured by mechanical tabulation and a pedestrian style.

Intimate Glimpses from Browning's Letter File (Assembled by A. J. ARMSTRONG, with an Introduction by R. A. YOUNG, Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 1934. Pp. x + 139) reveals that between 1868-89 the poet received ten invitations to become a candidate for the Lord Rectorship of leading Scotch Universities. The letters are, in the main, casual correspondence, and there is little in them of permanent literary or historical value. The two most interesting and significant letters are Professor Blackie's acknowledgment of the receipt of Browning's *Agamemnon*, stating his views regarding the translation of classical poetry and the spelling of Greek names in English, and Mr. Lyall's commentary on *Omar Khayyâm*, when sending Browning a copy of his article on Fitzgerald's *Rubaiyat*.

WILLIAM O. RAYMOND

Bishop's University

William Shakespeare A Handbook. By THOMAS MARC PARROTT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934. Pp. viii + 266. \$1.25. For the student who requires an easy introduction that will increase his understanding of the plays he is reading and encourage him to read more it is hard to see how this little volume could be bettered. The author has kept it simple: his *Shakespeare* is less tabular and documented than some of the handbooks; mooted points are usually though not invariably labelled as such, but they are not as a rule analyzed. The writing is sensitive and charming; yet aesthetic appreciations and biographical difficulties are never handled sentimentally. Any undergraduate, from the class poet to the chestiest gorilla of the football squad, will, if he can read at all, find Professor Parrott's essay style painless and profitable. There are six illustrations, an appendix on metrical statistics, a chronological table, and an index. Professor Odell's *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving* deserves the encomium pronounced in the brief annotated bibliography, but it appears to be responsible for the repetition of an error which I thought I had more than scotched: *Hamlet* did not hold the Restoration stage "in unchanged form except for certain cuts." (P. 229.)

H. S.

English Plays 1660-1820. Edited by A. E. MORGAN. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935. Pp. x + 1157. \$4.00. The latest volume in the Plays and Playwrights Series is notable for the representation of several authors not to be found in similar collections: Hoadley, Townley, Murphy, Foote, Reynolds, Morton, and Buckstone. Twenty-five plays are included. The editor has

taken pains with his texts. Footnotes supply helpful glosses and variant readings. An excellent anthology.

H. S.

Cynewulf and his Poetry, by KENNETH SISAM. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1933 (for 1932). Pp. 31. \$.80. This lecture, the second of the Gollancz Memorial Lectures of the British Academy, is a notably sane study of the OE poet. One may object to sundry terms, such as *Celtic* (p. 21) where *Christian* is obviously the proper word, and *Anglo-Saxon* (p. 29) for the correct *Insular*, but such infelicities do not affect the main points of the argument.

K. M.

Une Chronique Anglo-Saxonne, translated by MARIE HOFFMANN-HIRTZ. Strasbourg: Librairie Universitaire d'Alsace, 1933. Pp. 173. This translation into French of the Parker Chronicle is one of the fruits of the stay of Professor F. P. Magoun as visiting professor in the University of Strasbourg not long since. Mr. Magoun's enthusiasm for Old-English studies proved contagious there as elsewhere, and Miss Hoffmann-Hirtz was moved to undertake the work which now lies before us. She and her preceptors are to be congratulated that she has done so well what she set out to do.

K. M.

Eger and Grime, A parallel-text edition of the Percy and the Huntington-Laing Versions of the Romance, with an Introductory Study, by J. R. CALDWELL. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature IX. Cambridge [Mass.]: Harvard Univ. Press, 1933. Pp. ix + 353. \$3.50. All students of the metrical romances will welcome this edition, which gives us on opposite pages the two chief versions of *Gray Steel*, or *Eger and Grime* as the editor prefers to call the romance. It is unfortunate, however, that such an edition was included in Schofield's *Studies*, a series not designed for anything of the sort. In his effort to make the edition fit in better, the editor has given linguistic matters short shrift and stuffed his introduction with much comparative literary material familiar to everybody and hardly worth reprinting.

K. M.

The Knowledge of Greek in England in the Middle Ages, by G. R. STEPHENS. Philadelphia, 1933. Pp. 167. This dissertation gives us a useful survey of an important matter. The author adds little that is new, but he brings together in a systematic form much pertinent material. Interesting to the student of English

culture is the author's statement that "largely" because of the Norman Conquest "in England study of all kinds received a temporary check and Greek practically disappeared" (p. 49). One gathers that the "temporary check" lasted long, since later we are told: "While signs are not wanting that the spirit of twelfth century humanism was reaching England, such signs are neither so early nor so numerous as we might expect. . . . This is especially apparent in the very slow advance made in the study of Greek" (p. 54). One misses in the bibliography the name of Albert S. Cook. Wærferth should have been mentioned alongside Plegmund on p. 38.

K. M.

Beowulf, by F. OLIVERO. Turin, 1934. Pp. cxliv + 257. This handsome volume contains the text of the OE epic and a translation into Italian. The text is preceded by a long introductory essay, and followed by 15 pages of bibliographical matter. The text printed is that of Wyatt-Chambers, but the editor and translator shows familiarity with the edition of Klaeber as well. The book is not free from mistakes, as in the derivation (p. cix) of OE *ór* from Latin *hora* (instead of *ora*), but one welcomes it as a worthy effort to make accessible to wider circles the noblest monument of the English heroic age.

K. M.

Old Icelandic Sources in the English Novel, by R. B. ALLEN. Philadelphia, 1933. Pp. 121. This dissertation includes, not only works to be expected from the title, but also translations, adaptations, and tales done somewhat in the style of the sagas or set in Viking times; Kingsley's *Hereward*, Hall Caine's *Bondman*, Scott's *Pirate* and Rider Haggard's *Eric Brighteyes* are considered in a special chapter, while Maurice Hewlett has a chapter all his own. The volume makes pleasant reading but has no scholarly value. One notes that the author translates *Fornmannasögur* with 'foreign men's sagas' (p. 67).

K. M.

Caxton: Tulle of Old Age, ed. HEINZ SUSEBACH; Morsbach-Hecht's Studien zur engl. Philologie LXXV. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1933. Pp. xxii + 118. RM. 5. We have here a corrected or, better, emended text of Worcester's translation of the *De Senectute*, and a glossary of the words of romanian origin which occur in the text. The emendations grew out of a comparison of the text of Caxton with that of the *De Vieillesse* of Laurence de Primo Facto (the work which Worcester actually translated). The Latin text was also brought to bear when needful. Caxton's readings, when departed from, are duly recorded in footnotes.

K. M.